DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 756 HE 003 807

TITLE	Interinstitutional Cooperation in California Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	Academy for Educational Development, Inc., Palo Alto, Calif. Western Region.; California State Legislature, Sacramento. Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education.
PUB DATE	Jan 73
NOTE	79p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Consortia; Cooperative Education; *Cooperative Programs; *Higher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS	California

ABSTRACT

In a recent report, the Carnegie Commission found that in the process of expanding educational opportunity, there was great merit in forming consortia or cooperative arrangements among and between colleges and universities in the same geographical location. It is the purpose of this report to examine the potential benefits of interinstitutional cooperation in California, the extent to which such cooperation is now pursued, obstacles to further cooperation, and the steps that the California legislature might reasonably take to substantially expand such cooperation. (Author/HS)

ED 072756

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INC.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 003 207

PREPARED FOR

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN CALIFORNIA HIGHER EDUCATION

Academy for Educational Development, Inc.
Palo Alto, California
Washington, D.C.
Akron, Ohio
New York
Paris

Prepared for

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE MASTER PLAN
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

California Legislature
Assembly Post Office Box 83
State Capitol
Sacramento, California 95814

Assemblymen	Senators
John Vasconcellos (Chairman)	Howard Way (Vice Chairman)
Willie Brown	Alfred Alquist
Jerry Lewis	Dennis Carpenter
Ken Meade	Mervyn Dymally
John Stull	Albert Rodda

Patrick M. Callan, Consultant
Daniel Friedlander, Assistant Consultant
Sue Powell, Assistant Consultant
Elizabeth Richter, Secretary

January, 1973

This is one of a series of policy alternative papers commissioned by the California Legislature's Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education.

The primary purpose of these papers is to give legislators an overview of a given policy area. Most of the papers are directed toward synthesis and analysis of existing information and perspectives rather than the gathering of new data. The authors were asked to raise and explore prominent issues and to suggest alternatives available to the Legislature in dealing with those issues.

The Joint Committee has not restricted its consultants to discussions and recommendations in those areas which fall exclusively within the scope of legislative responsibility. The authors were encouraged to direct comments to individual institutions, segmental offices, state agencies — or wherever seemed appropriate. It is hoped that these papers will stimulate public, segmental and institutional discussion of the critical issues in post-secondary education.

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INC
a nonprofit planning organization

December, 1972

The Honorable John Vasconcellos, Chairman
Joint Committee on the Master Plan for
Higher Education
California Legislature
Sacramento, California 95814

Dear Mr. Vasconcellos:

We are pleased to submit this report on interinstitutional cooperation in fulfillment of our contract LCB #17716.

The study was made under the counsel of the following panel of consultants:

Dr. Otto Butz, President, Golden Gate University
Dr. John C. Hoy, Vice Chancellor, Student Affairs, University of California, Irvine
Dr. Thomas H. McGrath, President, California State College, Sonoma
Dr. Norvel Smith, President, Merritt College

Their insights and wisdom were invaluable to us in conducting the study. The report does not necessarily reflect a consensus on all points, although there was general agreement. The responsibility for data and conclusions is ours. Nor did the consultants represent the segments from which they came, but rather brought to us the benefit of their diverse experience.

We hope that this report will lead to more effective collaboration among California's universities and colleges.

Sincerely,

Robert Hind
Director
Western Region

RH:gb

PALO ALTO OFFICE: 770 WELCH ROAD, PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA 94304 (415) 327-2270

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION 1

2. THE FORMS, OBJECTIVES AND BENEFITS OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION. . . . 4

3. SURVEY OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN CALIFORNIA. 14

4. INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN OTHER STATES 27

5. OBSTACLES TO INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION. 40

6. WAYS IN WHICH THE LEGISLATURE MAY ENCOURAGE GREATER INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN CALIFORNIA. 50

APPENDIX 58

A. Cover Letter 59

B. Questionnaire 60

C. List of Consortia. 63

D. Summary of Responses 73

1. INTRODUCTION

Most colleges and universities, in California and across the country, participate in cooperative ventures of some kind -- joint use of computer facilities, informal cooperation in student admissions policies, articulation agreements, sharing of federally funded research facilities, for example. It could not be otherwise, indeed, because of the sheer number of institutions engaged in essentially the same kinds of activity.

Nevertheless, it is also true, as has been brought out in the public hearings of the Joint Committee on the Master Plan, that this cooperation is, with a few notable exceptions, quite limited and often superficial in the extent to which it involves the primary resources of each institution. Although the pressures for interinstitutional cooperation would seem to be very strong, the ability of most institutions to resist those pressures appears to be even stronger. The traditional concept of a campus as an academically self-sufficient unit able to meet all the needs of its students and faculty (or striving to do so) seems little disturbed by the changes that have occurred in the surrounding social environment. This appears particularly true in California, where the segmental structure of public higher education has done much to encourage intrasegmental coordination but often at the cost of creating greater obstacles to interinstitutional cooperation across segmental lines.

These obstacles to interinstitutional cooperation may be of little consequence if the concept of the self-sufficient campus remains valid, if there is not real reason, for example, for the community colleges and public and private four-year institutions within each metropolitan area to

coordinate their educational programs for the benefit of the residents of their area, to take advantage of the special strengths of each institution. There is little point in pursuing cooperation simply because it sounds like a good thing; there has to be a substantive objective, a measurable benefit to the students, faculty, or the community generally, to justify the effort which interinstitutional cooperation requires.

Testimony before the Joint Committee has made it abundantly clear that most campus administrators are satisfied with the degree of cooperation that now exists and are unconvinced as to the need for intervention by the Legislature, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, or any other agency in this matter. Yet a number of prominent educators and others who have studied the question have concluded that greater interinstitutional cooperation is not only desirable as a means of making better use of scarce resources but as an important way of adapting institutions of higher education to the changing needs of society. According to a recent report by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, for example, the predominent characteristic of higher education in the last three decades of this century may be a movement "away from participation in forming institutional higher education in the years immediately following high school toward a more free-flowing pattern of participation spread over a broader span of years, perhaps well into middle age and beyond . . . this changing pattern of participation in higher education should . . . be encouraged by changes in degree structure; by changes in employer selection policies; and by the development of open universities, and federal degree systems, and other innovations designed to stimulate a more flexible pattern of higher education experience." 1

Among the ways in which a more flexible pattern of higher education can be developed, the Commission said, is through greater interinstitutional cooperation. The recent acceleration of the formation of consortia and other cooperative arrangements, the Commission noted, "is full of promise."

> It represents a way in which small liberal arts colleges can strengthen and broaden their programs by sharing facilities and courses with other institutions. It represents a path which universities with modest graduate programs can follow to provide for their graduate students a much broader selection of advanced courses than could be offered by any one of the cooperating institutions. And . . . it can even be used by large universities with

---

1. New Students and New Places, The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, McGraw-Hill, October 1971, 39.

> comprehensive doctoral programs to improve access to highly specialized courses.
>
> Nevertheless, despite the promise in the consortium movement, many existing consortia are largely arrangements on paper that have little actual impact. Universities and colleges tend to be reluctant to relinquish their own sovereignty in program development and aim continuously at strength in all fields. Such policies are extremely shortsighted when there are major potentialities for sharing resources and facilities with neighboring institutions.[2]

The Commission found particular merit in "consortia or cooperative arrangements among institutions within the same metropolitan area or within a broader region for the purpose of sharing faculty, courses, and educational facilities." And it specifically recommended that colleges and universities "continue to seek ways of sharing facilities, courses, and specialized programs through cooperative arrangements . . ."

It is the purpose of this report to examine the potential benefits of interinstitutional cooperation in California, the extent to which such cooperation is now pursued, obstacles to further cooperation, and the steps which the Legislature might reasonably take to substantially expand such cooperation. In doing so we admit to a bias in favor of efforts to make higher education more responsive to the public interest -- and to democratize higher education -- at the expense of administrative convenience and the apparent self-interest of individual institutions.

---

2. Ibid., 93.

2. THE FORMS, OBJECTIVES, AND BENEFITS OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

Cooperation among institutions of higher education can take many forms: agreement by a community college to provide classroom space in the evening to a distant university for an upper division extension course, establishment of a joint research station to serve several colleges that can't justify such a venture on their own, creation of a formal legal entity to administer community service programs in which several metropolitan institutions want to participate, establishment of an intercampus bus service to aid students to enroll at nearby institutions in courses which are not available on their own campuses. These are only a few examples; there is, in fact, no limit to the ways in which two or more institutions can cooperate for their mutual benefit.

Much the same is true of the forms cooperative arrangements can take. Nevertheless, there are eight identifiable organizational forms which are most frequently employed to facilitate interinstitutional cooperation. These are: cluster colleges, coordinate colleges, research and instructional centers, multi-purpose consortia, single purpose consortia, multicampus statewide systems, regional associations and compacts, and informal bilateral cooperation.

Probably the oldest and certainly the least common form is that of the cluster college. The Claremont Colleges in Claremont, California, are the best example in this country, and the term itself is necessarily defined by their relationship -- a grouping of small independent campuses, immediately adjacent to one another, which share certain central services, permit free cross-registration of students, and make some

joint use of faculty and facilities.[1] The Five Colleges in Massachusetts are not yet as closely bound together as the Claremont Colleges, but are nevertheless similar in several respects and may in fact offer a good example of a cluster college in the making. Although some single institutions have employed the cluster college concept to decentralize undergraduate instruction (e.g., UC Santa Cruz and the University of the Pacific), such institutional forms do not involve the sort of interinstitutional cooperation under consideration here.

Closely related to the cluster college is the "coordinate college." The term "coordinate college" or "affiliated colleges," is used to describe paired institutions, most often an independent men's college and an independent women's college, which have joined to strengthen their faculties and instructional offerings and to give their students some of the benefits of a coeducational environment. Marymount College and Loyola University, for example, formed an affiliated college in 1968 when Marymount moved from Palos Verdes to the Loyola campus.

Many institutions that have felt a common need for expanded research or graduate instruction (or both) but lacked the necessary resources individually, have set up research and instructional centers either on one of the participating campuses or, more commonly, at a separate site. Such centers have also been set up by outside agencies. The Atlanta University Center, for example, was organized as a separate institution by the participating colleges to provide a joint use facility within easy commuting distance. The Graduate Research Center of the Southwest, on the other hand, was set up by the State of Texas in 1961 as a private institution to provide cooperative assistance to other private institutions in Texas. In many cases, it is the availability of federal aid for costly new equipment, contingent upon some form of interinstitutional cooperation, which provides the necessary impetus for the creation of such centers.

A fourth and increasingly popular form of interinstitutional cooperation is the multipurpose academic consortium. A multipurpose consortium is usually a formal arrangement for the development and administration of a series

---

1. The Claremont Colleges are Pomona, Scripps, Harvy Mudd, Pitzer, and Claremont Men's College and the Claremont University Center, which operates the Claremont Graduate School and administers the joint facilities and services.

of educational, research, community service, or administrative programs by two or more institutions of higher education which are located relatively close to one another. In practice, a consortium may be a tightly knit organization set up by three or four institutions which are not more than a few miles apart, or it may be a sprawling collection of campuses and related institutions with no ties other than their common interest in the projects administered by the consortium. According to a recent count, there are some 61 such multipurpose consortia in the United States, of which two are in California (The Claremont Colleges -- classified as a consortium in this study -- and the San Francisco Consortium).

Much more numerous are single purpose consortia, often formed for a limited period for a specific purpose such as to undertake a community service project, seek federal funds, share special library collections, or carry on a limited student or faculty exchange program. There are several hundred such consortia throughout the country. Commonly, the participants are all one type of institution -- community colleges, small private colleges, large universities, for example -- and there is no full-time staff.

The dominant form of organization linking public campuses in California is the statewide system -- i.e., the UC, the CSUC, and the California Community Colleges. Although the institutions within each system are largely self-sufficient, there are many important intrasegmental forms of cooperation involving facilities planning, academic specialization, the transfer of students, etc. In the case of the community colleges, such cooperation (which is not necessarily voluntary) occurs mainly within the large districts that operate more than one college. As a practical matter, much of this cooperation is imposed from above -- that is, by the statewide or district headquarters, or in the case of computer sharing among the CSUC campuses, by the Legislature. And in many important areas of operation, there is fierce competition to keep up with whichever campuses within the system have developed the widest range of programs and the most impressive collections of instructional research resources. Nevertheless, there are also many areas in which the individual institutions cooperate closely.

Regional associations and compacts are often similar in form and purpose to multipurpose consortia, but the goals are usually fewer, the relationship among the members much looser, and the geographic area much larger. Contact between members usually occurs only at the presidential level or involves special institutional representatives. The Associated Colleges of the Midwest, the Great Lakes College Association, and the Central States College Association are examples.

Interstate compacts, such as the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education and the New England Board of Higher Education, have also become popular devices for linking a large number of institutions in different states to facilitate student exchange in certain high-cost programs (e.g., medicine), as well as for a variety of other purposes, because they usually make few formal organizational demands on member institutions and require only a minimal commitment of campus resources.

Finally, there are the informal, usually bilateral, arrangements for interinstitutional cooperation that link departments, faculty members, student organizations, or administrative staff on an ad hoc basis. The larger the institution, the more extensive its network of informal cooperative arrangements with other institutions is likely to be. In some cases, these arrangements may harden into formal agreements for such purposes as joint honors programs, joint graduate study, cooperation in the arts, and cooperative activity in athletics, library development, and extracurricular cultural programs, etc. More often, however, they simply fade away when their immediate purpose has been served, or when the participants have lost interest or have gone to other posts.

Objectives and Benefits

The objectives of interinstitutional cooperation can be as varied as the functions and activities of institutions of higher education. Most existing arrangements, however, are intended to serve one or more of the following objectives:

(1) To increase opportunities for grants from federal agencies and foundations through joint project applications;

(2) To reduce the cost of libraries, computer services, standard supplies, management information services, etc.;

(3) To expand educational opportunities in new fields at minimum cost;

(4) To provide educational programs and services in geographic areas otherwise inadequately served;

(5) To improve student and faculty recruitment by expanding the opportunities for study, research, and association;

(6) To assist in the strengthening of "developing" institutions; or

(7) To share the financial and other risks of community service programs.

In the case of informal arrangements, the objectives may be unstated or expressed in very specific and limited terms. Formal organizations for interinstitutional cooperation on the other hand, may claim much more generalized and comprehensive objectives. There is, indeed, a noticeable weakness among participants in consortia and other similar arrangements for inflated program descriptions which go well beyond anything obtainable with the limited resources committed to the arrangement.

Fritz H. Gruppe, who perhaps has had as much direct experience with consortia as anyone in higher education, has had this to say about the expectations which have grown up around many consortia:

> The formation of consortia represents a basic commitment by institutions of higher education to identify, explore, and cultivate areas in which mutual action can improve their collective impact. . . . . At the same time, as new centers are being created, there is a concomitant rise in the expectations of what these groups can and should achieve . . . Obviously, the easily repeated cliches about more effective ultilization of resources, enrichment of programs, economy of operation, and institutional revitalization combine to make a glib ideology that is captured in significant operational arrangements only with difficulty.[2]

In practice, few consortia have developed much beyond being devices for funding and administering a handful of specific projects which have little impact upon the central activities and programs of the participating institutions. Real cooperation, apparently, takes a long time to develop, not only because the participants are uncertain about their real objectives, but because of the great difficulty in surmounting traditional concepts of institutional autonomy and the reluctance of administrators and faculty to surrender prerogatives which they consider to be vital to their institutions and their own well-being. "A consortium's potential is primarily set by

---

2. Fritz H. Gruppe, "Founding Consortia: Idea and Reality," The Journal of Higher Education, December 1971, 748-9.

the characteristics of its members," Gruppe has observed, "rather than by the nature of the organizational structures or by the leadership capability of the consortium staff.[3] Nor is success assured by the obvious merit, on paper, of a consortium's objectives.

Achievements

Unfortunately, there have been very few published studies of the extent to which cooperative arrangements have achieved the objectives set out for them. One reason is that those who are in the best position to evaluate their programs usually have a vested interest in the success of the programs. In other cases, the absence of any independent effort of evaluation reflects the fact that the cooperative arrangement was begun with no more than a vague idea of what it was to accomplish.

Moreover, it is relatively easy to say that through cooperation the costs of some function will be reduced (to each participant, if not in total), or that it will be done better, but the actual saving is often extremely difficult to prove either in advance or in retrospect except in the most limited projects (e.g., joint purchasing arrangement and joint student health services). This is true not only of educational benefits, which at best are largely matters of subjective judgment and related to pre-established values, but also of administrative and financial benefits, which should be amenable for fairly precise quantitative measurement.

It is also true that frequently the savings to be obtained through cooperative programs are "negative" savings -- rather than doing the same thing at less cost, the objective is to do more without a proportionate increase in costs. This point has been emphasized by Lewis Patterson, who has closely observed the development of a wide variety of cooperative arrangements over the last several years. "One of the few clear-cut answers regarding financial implications of consortia," says Patterson, "is that an institution will increase its operational costs, not diminish them, as a result of joining a multipurpose consortium. Experience has shown that the realization of actual dollar savings is usually limited to those programs specifically instigated to attain that end, such as joint purchasing of student insurance, food services, supplies, and the collection of student loans. The majority of consortium programs involve additional efforts and investments on the part of member institutions."[4]

---

3. Ibid., 751.

4. Lewis D. Patterson, "The Potential of Consortia," Compact, Vol. 5, No. 6, October 1971, p. 20.

For these reasons, there have been few efforts to date to assess the direct costs and savings of interinstitutional cooperation.[5] The only published study is one which was done by the Claremont Colleges, comparing their operating costs for libraries, business services, counseling, student health services, and campus maintenance with operating costs for similar institutions. Based upon the limited data available to them, the authors concluded that the Claremont system did indeed yield significant savings in library operation,[6] business services, and health services.

Potential Benefits

Nevertheless, it is reasonable to assume that there are benefits to be derived from greater interinstitutional cooperation in California, financial and educational benefits

---

5. Discussing this same problem in 1970, in an unpublished paper on Voluntary Cooperation for Effective Resource Allocation for the Public Policy Research Organization, UC Irvine, William K. Haldeman had this to say:

> There is a paucity of information extant on the effectiveness of the cooperative programs. This is true despite the substantial amount of resources devoted by institutions of high character each year to continuing consortium programs. But although the increasing numbers of cooperative arrangements continue to enjoy a climate of faith in their reasons for existing, we are forced to admit that we do not really know with any degree of certainty how well the job is getting done.
>
> The tools of evaluation of educational programs are not infallible and the objectives of the programs are too often unclearly stated, but the real need at this point in history of interinstitutional cooperation is for an administrative commitment to the hard task of program evaluation so that reliable information (as reliable as possible) on the effectiveness of their programs may be supplied to those who must furnish the resources for higher education.

6. Clifford T. Stewart and John W. Hartley, "Financial Aspects of Interinstitutional Cooperation: Unit Costs in Cluster and Non-Cluster Colleges," Claremont, Calif., June 1968.

which significantly outweigh the costs of achieving them. For the greater part, these benefits are to be found in doing things that are not being done now. The following are some examples:

(1) Coordination of extension programs offered by UC, CSUC, the Community Colleges, and private institutions in urban and rural areas.

Although there is substantial cooperation within the UC and CSUC systems in the development of extension programs, and between those two systems and the community colleges in several areas of the state, there appears to be minimal cooperation between the two four-year systems and between public and private institutions generally on a regional basis. As a consequence, it is difficult for service area residents to learn of the full range of offerings available to them, and the public and private institutions occasionally engage in competition for enrollment which is needlessly costly on all sides. With the continuing development of non-traditional education, the lack of greater intersegmental cooperation in this field is becoming increasingly difficult to justify.[7]

The fact that UC and CSUC have agreed to offer only upper division extension courses, leaving lower division courses to the community colleges, may somewhat reduce the possibility for duplication at that level, but it also increases the need for cooperative planning on the part of the two-year and four-year institutions so that their programs will mesh. At present the UC Extended University and the CSUC External Degree Program may still be small enough to be coordinated effectively at the statewide level, but as they grow, the potential for duplication and unproductive competition will grow, and there will be an increasingly urgent need for cooperation at the regional level.

---

7. See "Proposals for Regional Cooperation in Adult/Continuing Education," by the Adult Educators of Greater Los Angeles, submitted to CCHE Select Committee on the Master Plan, September 8, 1972.
Thomas H. McGrath, Chairman of the CSUC Commission on External Degree Programs, argues that the potential for unnecessary competition between the CSUC External Degree Program

(2) Expansion of intersegmental cross-registration opportunities for community college students.

In the Bay Area and in San Diego and Orange Counties, community college students are taking courses on UC and CSUC campuses in several highly specialized fields -- courses which the community colleges cannot justify because of their high costs and low enrollment and because they cannot attract the faculty to teach such courses. Many of these programs are intended to stimulate transfer of minority students to four-year programs. Generally, these opportunities for cross-registration have been developed at the initiative of individual faculty members and academic administrators who are aware of the need and who are personally interested in doing something about it. There is no reason, however, that such opportunities cannot be expanded to give more community college students the opportunities a few now enjoy and, at the same time, to bring the two-year and four-year institutions closer together.

Some have argued that there is little value in cooperation for community colleges -- they have a well-defined mission and need only to maintain close relations with local employers and with those four-year institutions to which most of their graduates transfer.[8]

---

and the UC Extended University is easily exaggerated; that, in fact, there is a great deal of cooperation between the staffs of the two agencies which meet regularly to share information, avoid duplication, and to plan cooperative activities. As evidence of this, Dr. McGrath says, the two segments now share all market survey data, are planning a joint research project on the need for external degree programs in the field of early childhood education, and the University has extended an invitation to CSUC faculty for cooperation in developing a statewide program in the humanities. There are no plans, Dr. McGrath says, for the development of inter-segmental academic programs. "It is the common judgment of (the UC and CSUC planners), who feel that cooperative activity is of great importance, that the conducting of common programs is infeasible now and will not be feasible in the foreseeable future."

8. See, for example, "The Social and Educational Implications of Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education," Robert J. Havighurst, Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, Lawrence C. Howard (Ed.), Institute of Human Relations, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wisc., 1967.

This not only overlooks the importance of cooperative program development in high-cost technical training programs among community colleges in the same metropolitan area, but it also ignores the potential benefits for students, faculty, and administrators for cooperative association with nearby four-year colleges and universities. Both kinds of institutions can gain from exchanges of personnel and resources of various kinds. For example, four-year institutions can provide special libraries and the educational facilities which a community college cannot duplicate, while a community college can act as the agent of the four-year institution in developing "outreach" programs that will mesh with the professional programs offered by the senior institution.

(3) Coordination of UC and CSUC graduate instruction and professional training.

The end of enrollment growth in graduate programs, and the actual decline in enrollment in some fields, has made it imperative that UC and CSUC campuses serving the same regions find ways in which to work more closely than they have to date, not only in developing new graduate programs, but in deciding how they will allocate their resources among existing programs. The termination of the joint doctoral programs through a legislative budget cut this year should not be used as justification for ignoring other potential forms of cooperation but as a reason for attempting to improve communication between the two segments on a broader basis.

These are only a few examples of areas in which greater interinstitutional -- and, especially, intersegmental -- cooperation can be productive. Others will be developed, we are convinced, when the existing barriers to cooperative programs and activities are lowered, with respect to many important educational services and related functions. The individual campus will remain the most effective operational unit. Yet it is increasingly urgent that those services and activities for which combinations of campuses provide a more effective planning and operating unit be identified and then that the mechanisms which will permit and encourage cooperative effort be created.

3. SURVEY OF INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN CALIFORNIA

Self-sufficiency has been valued too highly for too long to be abandoned lightly. Nevertheless, there seems to be a growing realization, not only among legislators and other state officials, but also among faculty and campus administrators, that there is much to be gained by greater cooperation among institutions of higher education, in part, because the spreading interest in non-traditional forms of education seems to dictate new organizational forms as well, and in part because it is all too obvious that there isn't going to be enough money from public or private sources to enable each institution to do everything it wants to do on its own. Thus, there has been, particularly within the past few years, a rapidly increasing number of experiments with various forms of interinstitutional cooperation. Unfortunately, however, there has been no systematic continuing effort to collect information on these activities. Although there have been several reports on specific examples of interinstitutional cooperation among California's institutions of higher education, there has been no comprehensive statewide survey of cooperative activities.[1]

Thus one of the principal elements of this study has been a survey of every accredited institution of higher education in the state -- community colleges, CSUC and UC campuses,

---

1. A survey conducted for the Coordinating Council in 1970 dealt only with arrangements for facilities sharing and was not in any case intended to produce a complete inventory. See Facilities Sharing Among Institutions of Higher Education in California. Council Report 71-7, Coordinating Council for Higher Education, July 1971.

and private colleges and universities -- to provide a preliminary inventory of the cooperative arrangements to which each institution is a party.[2] The survey instrument was a three-page questionnaire asking six questions:[3]

(1) Is your institution a part of a formally organized consortium of educational institutions?

(2) Does your institution participate in faculty exchanges with other institutions?

(3) Is there a formal, systematic arrangement for student exchanges or concurrent enrollment in your area in which your institution participates?

(4) Is your institution a participant in an arrangement (other than statewide articulation agreements among the three public sectors) to facilitate or articulate student transfer (e.g., from two-year to four-year colleges, 2-3 engineering programs, etc.)?

(5) Does your institution share facilities with other nearby institutions?

(6) If there is potential for educational or economic gain through cooperative arrangements with other nearby institutions, and they have not materialized, would you briefly indicate why, together with any suggestions you might have for facilitating such arrangements?

In answering each of the first five questions, the respondents were asked to briefly describe each cooperative arrangement or, if none existed, to comment as to the potential for cooperation of that type. A questionnaire was mailed

---

2. Our survey must be described as a "preliminary inventory" because in the short time available to us there was no opportunity to be as thorough as would be necessary to produce what could with reasonable accuracy be called a complete inventory. We particularly regret having had no time to follow up many of the responses that were obviously incomplete or that suggested additional questions.

3. See Appendix for complete questionnaire.

to the chief executive officer of every campus with the suggestion that it be answered by the campus officer most knowledgeable about the cooperative activities in which the institution participates.[4]

Of the 185 questionnaires mailed out, 152 were returned, giving a response rate of 82 per cent. Completed questionnaires were received from 69 community colleges, 18 CSUC campuses, nine UC campuses, and 56 private institutions.[5]

Consortia

According to our survey, 50 community colleges, 16 CSUC campuses, three UC campuses, and 16 private colleges and universities participate in one or more consortia. A total of 56 individual consortia were listed, of which the majority have been formed for the purpose of producing and broadcasting instructional television programs, coordinating health manpower programs, or coordinating vocational education.[6] All but three appear to be single-purpose consortia, and in most cases all participants are from a single segment.

The San Francisco Consortium, formed in 1966 by a group of faculty and staff representing the City College of San Francisco, The University of San Francisco, Golden Gate College, San Francisco State College, and the University of California, San Francisco (Hastings College of the Law and Lone Mountain joined later), has been the most ambitious effort to date. Its stated objectives are to "become the instrument through which the resources of the major educational institutions are brought more effectively to bear on the unsolved

---

4. Questionnaires returned by community colleges were commonly answered by the president or dean of instruction, as were those returned by private institutions. Those returned by UC campuses were most often answered by a vice-chancellor or assistant vice-chancellor, and those returned by a state university or college by an administrative vice-president or dean or the director of institutional studies.

5. A single questionnaire was mailed to the five Claremont Colleges, but to avoid confusion in tabulating the responses, we have counted it as five questionnaires mailed out and returned.

6. For a complete listing, see Appendix. In a few cases, institutions listed informal cooperative arrangements that did not appear to be consortia as that term is commonly understood. Such arrangements have not been included in our list.

problems of the modern urban environment" and to strengthen the instructional, research, and public service programs of the participating institutions through "coordination, exchange, or joint ventures." In 1968 the Consortium obtained a full-time director and, with support from several foundations, began activities in four fields: development of joint programs to aid disadvantaged students; establishment of an early childhood education center; preparation of an inventory of San Francisco's urban problems and a data bank on urban life; and encouragement of cooperation among the participating institutions with regard to library resources, extension programs, student aid and counseling, and the establishment of a downtown center. The downtown center, in which each institution would participate according to its particular strengths, remains the Consortium's most exciting proposal, although frustrated by failure to obtain necessary facilities and initial funding. At present, the Consortium is sponsoring several projects, including a small-scale student cross-registration program, but its future has been made uncertain by the failure of the participating institutions to increase their commitment and to obtain additional funding from external sources.

The San Francisco Consortium appears to be the only inter-segmental, multipurpose consortium in California, a fact that is indicative of the failure of California's institutions of higher education to form cooperative alliances across segmental lines for the purpose of enhancing educational and related services on a regional basis. Inter-segmental cooperation, where it occurs, is usually of an ad hoc and informal character that seldom makes continuing demands upon institutional resources and does not compromise campus autonomy. The principal exceptions are in the field of health care training and urban studies, although it is not clear in every case just how active the consortia in these fields actually are. Interestingly, only a few of the 67 institutions that are now members of a consortium were prepared to suggest potential ways in which a consortium might be of benefit in their area, and most of the suggestions that were made concerned specific functions, such as television broadcasting, library operation, and vocational education, rather than regional or area-wide cooperation of a more general character.

It should also be noted, however, that several CSUC campuses and several UC campuses reported that as members of a statewide system they are deeply involved in cooperative planning with their sister institutions in many areas of cooperation. Similarly, several of those community colleges that are members of multicampus districts pointed out that they engage in many cooperative activities with the other community colleges in their districts. This is certainly true; the

segmental structure of public higher education in California results in a great deal of interinstitutional cooperation among like institutions -- in educational planning, budgeting, student allocations, etc. And in the case of the multi-campus community college districts, such cooperation can be regional in character because the individual campuses are often close enough geographically to permit effective cooperation on an operational basis.

Recently, UC and the CSUC have developed plans for the establishment of intra-segmental consortia to become, for each segment, a system-wide degree granting agency in certain academic fields and to serve as a credit bank with responsibility for arranging and monitoring articulation agreements and maintaining counseling services.

Nevertheless, as important as this kind of cooperation can be, it does not obviate the need for cooperation among different kinds of institutions, in which each institution can pursue its own strengths without the necessity of duplicating programs and services that may be better performed by another institution.

Faculty Exchange

The survey uncovered only two examples of faculty exchange agreements that involve more than a few individuals. One of these is the Claremont Colleges' arrangement which, as perhaps the most advanced example of interinstitutional cooperation in the nation, provides for extensive sharing of facilities, faculty, and students by the five member colleges. The other is the Graduate Theological Union in Berkeley, which links together nine small seminaries, allowing them to exchange faculty, students, facilities, and other resources. Apart from these two cases, there appear to be only isolated examples of sharing -- for example: Porterville Community College shares three instructors with Bakersfield Community College; Pacific College of Fresno reports that it occasionally exchanges faculty with CSU Fresno; and the California College of Arts and Crafts exchanges one faculty member with UCLA. Altogether, only 17 institutions -- two UC campuses, two CSUC campuses, four community colleges, and 13 private colleges -- reported faculty exchange arrangements.

A number of other institutions reported an informal kind of faculty exchange involving the part-time (often overtime) employment of faculty members of one institution by another. For example, some faculty of four-year institutions find additional employment as part-time community college instructors, CSUC campuses often employ community college teachers in their off-campus extension programs, and UC extension courses often employ both community college and CSUC

faculty on a part-time basis. In addition, a few institutions employ the staff of non-academic institutions in special teaching situations (e.g., CSU San Francisco uses staff of the California Academy of Sciences to direct some student research projects in biology and the earth sciences).

Although the number of cooperative arrangements that provide directly for faculty exchange is small, there appears to be considerable interest, particularly among the smaller private colleges and community colleges, in expanding faculty exchange opportunities. Interest is especially high among those institutions that, for financial or other reasons, find themselves at a competitive disadvantage in hiring capable faculty in highly specialized fields and in those areas in which faculty require more extensive research opportunities than the smaller institutions are able to provide. At the same time, however, it was frequently stated that little in the way of faculty exchange is likely to occur until there is greater flexibility in the salary and fringe benefit provisions in most faculty contracts. Customarily, these provisions reflect the fact that the employing institution intends to have exclusive right to the services of its faculty.

Student Exchange

Not surprisingly, student exchange arrangements (formal agreements for cross-registration or concurrent enrollment) are much more common than faculty exchange agreements. This does not mean, however, that large numbers of students are permitted to enroll at a second institution. The evidence is that most exchange agreements involve only a relatively few students.

Formal student exchange agreements occur most frequently at the community college level. Neighboring community college districts frequently permit a free exchange of students who take six units or less. Several also authorize concurrent enrollment of full-time students who need specialized, high-cost courses that neighboring colleges do not offer. For example, the Chabot, Contra Costa, and Peralta Community College Districts report that they have a special inter-district attendance agreement for students in fire science, supervision and management, real estate, and police science, as do Hartnell, Cabrillo, Monterey Peninsula, and Gavilan Community Colleges in a number of other vocational programs.

Several private institutions have small exchange programs in areas in which at least one of the participants has a very strong program. Thus, Cal Tech and Occidental exchange about ten students each year in mathematics, physics, psychology, and music; the Holy Names College has an agreement

with Mills College and St. Mary's College permitting students to cross-register on a space available basis; and the University of Redlands and Loma Linda University permit a few graduate students to enroll concurrently at both institutions.

Similarly, several public institutions have special cross-registration agreements with another public institution or with a private college. For example, students at Merritt College who are training to become optometric assistants take part of their course work in the evenings at UC Berkeley's School of Optometry, and Long Beach Community College students enrolled in training to become audiometric assistants are able to use the CSU Long Beach speech and hearing clinic on a limited basis. Most of these programs involve only a very few students, however. Although there are no figures available, it is probable that concurrent enrollment by students who enroll part-time at two institutions on their own initiative, substantially exceeds concurrent enrollment under formal interinstitutional agreements.

The reasons why there is not more opportunity for cross-registration are not difficult to find. Differences in tuition charges often discourage any proposal for opening classrooms to students from another institution that involves more than a handful of students. This has proved a particular stumbling block with the San Francisco Consortium, which includes both public and private institutions, with a wide range of tuition charge. And among the larger colleges and universities, there seems to be a common belief that their students have no needs which they cannot satisfy themselves. For example, in response to our question about student exchange agreements, a large CSUC campus responded:

> It is conceivable that a student might wish to enroll in a course in a highly esoteric field which is not offered on the campus of his home institution. However, given a full range of offerings at (name of institution), it is most unlikely that any regularly enrolled student on this campus would find it necessary to take a course on the campus of a neighboring institution. Some of the private institutions in the area might have students who would wish to take advantage of some of the more specialized course offerings at (this institution); they are welcome to apply for admission and enroll. Insofar as the needs of these students might lie in the science areas with high cost laboratories, however, it should be understood that our laboratory facilities on this campus are in most cases seriously overcrowded already.

Nevertheless, there appears to be a good deal of interest in developing student exchange programs, especially to expand the course offerings in foreign languages, sciences, and other areas for students who are enrolled at the small private colleges and universities, and to maximize vocational training opportunities for community college students. To do so it will be necessary, it would seem, to give academic administrators at the larger institutions an opportunity to gain a broader perspective -- to see beyond the needs and capabilities of their own institutions, to gain a sense of the needs of the larger community -- of those who don't attend their institution as well as those who do.

Articulation

The principal contact between two-year and four-year institutions of higher education occurs at the point of acceptance or rejection of student course credits by the senior institution. Thus, articulation agreements -- formal or informal agreements governing the acceptance of units earned at a community college by a four-year institution -- although often overlooked as elements of interinstitutional cooperation, are nevertheless important indicators of cooperative effort, besides being of more than passing interest, of course, to transferring students.

The transfer of credits from a community college to a CSUC or UC campus is governed by statewide articulation agreements between the community colleges and each of the senior segments. The actual acceptance of specific community college course credits as meeting the requirements of four-year institutions for particular majors, however, is largely a matter to be decided by the individual institutions. However, some community colleges have worked out special articulation agreements with each of the public sectors by negotiating an agreement with one member of a segment which is then extended to all members of that segment. This is a commendable example of interinstitutional cooperation. According to the responses to question four on our questionnaire, most of the community colleges have negotiated, or are negotiating, such agreements.

Yet it is difficult to determine from these responses alone whether the supplementary agreements are important or not. Quite a number of community colleges reported that they were working on articulation agreements for "paraprofessional" and other vocational course credits and were strongly interested in gaining additional agreements. Others indicated, however, that articulation was no particular problem. For example, one community college, in response to our question regarding articulation agreements, replied:

> This does not appear to be a problem in California. The state articulation conferences between the three segments of higher education seem to be sufficient to solve any problems related to articulation of students from the community colleges to four-year institutions.

Another community college, which also said it had no special agreements with individual four-year institutions, responded:

> Not a great need. Most of our students transfer within the state system and have very little difficulty. This is the same for students who transfer to colleges out of state. Very few problems in either case.

For others, however, it is evident that supplementary articulation agreements are quite important, particularly in vocational fields in which transferring students are most likely to encounter difficulty -- either in getting credit for specialized community college training or in being admitted to programs for which there are enrollment ceilings, or both. The responses of several four-year institutions indicated that they also see a need for doing more in this area.

Facilities Sharing[7]

Slightly more than half the institutions that responded to the questionnaire reported some kind of facilities sharing. Nearly half of the reported examples of such sharing, however, involve either the use of community college classrooms for UC and CSUC off-campus extension programs or an agreement providing for the sharing of library materials, principally by way of interlibrary loans. Another common form of sharing is the use of community hospital facilities by community colleges for their nurse training programs.

Among the less common examples of facilities sharing

---

7. Many community colleges reported formal and informal agreements with the public schools for the sharing of athletic facilities, classrooms, television equipment, and other facilities and equipment. These arrangements, although important as a means of conserving educational resources, have been excluded from consideration here, as have faculty and student exchange programs with institutions in other states and countries.

reported were the agreement between CSU Chico and Butte College to use one another's agricultural facilities, the use of UCLA's special physical therapy equipment by students at CSU Northridge, the use of Pacific Union's industrial education facilities by students from Napa Junior College, and the use of UC Santa Barbara's computer center by students from Westmont College and Santa Barbara Community College. The CSUC have developed an intra-segmental computer sharing system providing a timeshare network linking all 19 CSUC campuses. A systemwide project is now under way to strengthen instructional uses of computer-based materials.

Based on the responses to this questionnaire, however, there has been little increase in facility sharing since the 1970 Coordinating Council study. Apart from a few isolated examples of extensive sharing (e.g., the Moss Landing Marine Laboratories) and the use of community college classrooms by four-year institutions for their extension courses, there appears to be very little cooperative use of plant and equipment among California's public and private institutions of higher education. Nor does there seem to be very much interest in greater sharing. Our questionnaire produced only a few suggestions as to areas in which additional sharing might be beneficial, and a number of institutions indicated little or no interest in this type of cooperation. For example, a UC campus answered the question about facilities sharing with the statement: "At the moment there are no nearby institutions with facilities that would meet our needs." Another UC campus reported: "The only 'nearby' institutions are either private or community colleges with a different mission than the University. There are possibilities that some sharing of facilities will develop over time, but the likelihood of major joint efforts does not seem imminent." Similarly, a community college replied: "In a large metropolitan community college with no other community colleges close by, sharing of facilities is not feasible," and a large state university campus reported: "Basically, our answer is no, since we currently have in excess of 30,000 students and we are using our own facilities from 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. daily with some classes meeting on Saturday morning."

Potential for Greater Cooperation

The last question in the survey asked whether campus officials believe there is potential for educational or economic gain through cooperative arrangements with other nearby institutions, and if so, what might be done to encourage such arrangements. Roughly half of those who answered the first question failed to give any answer to this question, suggesting a certain lack of interest, at best. Many of those who did answer the question, however, provided very succint

explanations as to why there has been so little interinstitutional cooperation. Perhaps typical of these responses was that of a small private university:

> There is some potential but our people are very busy keeping our own programs going. Cooperative arrangements take a great amount of additional time and effort. In the current financial situation it is extremely difficult to commit any resources to new projects and programs.

The smaller private colleges and community colleges appear, by their answers to our questionnaire, to be most sensitive to the need for cooperation. Yet a large urban community college was able to dismiss the question with these words:

> The campus of the University of California closest to us and the campus of the California State University and Colleges system closest to us do have cooperative arrangements for the use of libraries by our faculty members. With our open enrollment policy some students at these institutions do take individual courses at our college. Other than this I see no reason for further cooperative programs.

For another community college, the need for cooperation is satisfied within its multicampus district:

> Since (name of district) is a multicampus district, we have no immediate reason for seeking cooperative arrangements with other nearby institutions. At present, we coordinate within the district to avoid duplication of expensive programs.

A similar viewpoint was expressed by a large state university campus but with a slightly different perspective:

> The potential for educational or economic gain is not apparent in large mature universities. Our location is such that transportation arrangements would be difficult for students. In practice, a student may enroll in another institution for a special course; the initiative is his and the institutions need no special arrangement for this to occur. It would take clear evidence that cooperative arrangements would aid the students and the University before involvement would occur. At present, such evidence is not apparent.

This sense of institutional self-assurance was echoed by another state university:

> Other institutions in this area might benefit substantially from an opportunity to enter into cooperative arrangements with (name of the institution). There would be little reciprocal advantage to this campus.

Several other institutions indicated that they had given more thought to the possibilities for cooperation, but for a variety of reasons are now "lukewarm" about the prospects. Among the most thoughtful responses was this from a large private university:

> Interinstitutional cooperation, consortia, exchanges, etc., lend themselves, at least intuitively, to cost/benefit analysis. Over my several years at (name of institution), I've heard many possibilities discussed in terms of benefits and very few implemented because, I believe, the cost far outweighed the benefit. Because most individuals find all their academic or professional needs met at (this institution), it's been our experience that most special arrangements with other institutions benefit a very few individuals. The cost per person benefited has, therefore, been very high. We have, as a consequence, generally opted to make broader improvements at home with whatever dollars might be available for new ventures.

A large suburban state university campus acknowledged the potential for both educational and economic gains from cooperative arrangements with nearby institutions, but gave these reasons why greater cooperation had not materialized:

> The rapid growth of our university and the preoccupation with our own development problems; the potential inconvenience to students; regulations and statutes that hamper cooperative arrangements; the strength of attitudes and habits of institutional autonomy; and the comparative lack of success and mutual benefits we experienced in a few of our earliest cooperative efforts.

(Nevertheless, this institution said it is expanding the number and variety of its cooperative arrangements.) Other institutions listed geographical isolation, lack of funding for student and faculty transportation, decentralized faculty

authority, overcrowded facilities, heavy faculty workloads, a shortage of staff time, and a lack of interest among neighboring institutions as obstacles to greater cooperation. Several colleges reported that they had approached other institutions about joint efforts but with little or no success. "All it would take to get us involved is the opportunity," reported one small private college. And a large community college summarized its view in these words:

> There is potential for educational and economic gain through various cooperative arrangement -- programs, facilities, staffing, etc. -- but two basic things must happen before it will work: (1) the unrealistic legal and other hurdles must be diminished, and (2) a regional "superagency" would have to direct and coordinate it or it just won't happen.

Conclusion

Based upon the evidence gathered from this survey, it is clear that many of California's public and private colleges and universities are actively exploring the possibilities for interinstitutional cooperation. Yet it is almost inescapable that such cooperation is in its infancy. There is still an overriding emphasis upon institutional interests and objectives rather than upon the interests of students and upon the interests of the communities and regions which the institutions are expected to serve. In the absence of strong encouragement from the Legislature in the form of direct funding for cooperative endeavors, accompanied by actions designed to bring neighboring institutions together on a regional basis, it appears unlikely that the development of cooperative activities will be accelerated. Although some educators believe that external pressures may only inhibit the expansion of informal cooperation, it seems clear that if the Legislature wants to achieve greater interinstitutional cooperation, it will have to take direct action to create a climate in which cooperation can grow.

4. INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN OTHER STATES

Over the past 15 years, there have been a number of surveys aimed at measuring the extent and character of interinstitutional cooperation in several of the larger states and across the country.[1] In general, these surveys have found considerable interest in the potential benefits of wider cooperation and some outstanding examples of cooperative arrangements of real promise, although, too often, interinstitutional cooperation has been more a matter of talk than of action.

A nationwide survey conducted by the Academy early in 1972, however, uncovered substantial evidence that significant cooperation among colleges and universities is on the upswing.[2]

---

1. See, for example: Consortiums in American Higher Education 1965, Report of an Exploratory Study, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1968; Merton W. Ertell, Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, Albany, N.Y., State Education Department, June 1957; Facility Sharing Among Institutions of Higher Education in California, Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Council Report 71-7, July 1971; Interinstitutional Cooperative Arrangements in Higher Education in New York State, Office of Management Services in Higher Education, New York State Department of Higher Education, 1970; Survey of Interinstitutional Cooperation in Illinois, Executive Director's Report #105, Board of Higher Education, State of Illinois, 1972.

2. Putting Cooperation to Work, Management Division, Academy for Educational Development, Inc., New York, 1972.

On their own initiative or under legislative pressure, more and more institutions were found to be working together on problems they could not solve alone. Most of those problems were related back to financial pressures caused by cost increases which are not being matched by tuition resources or state appropriations. The rapid expansion of traditional fields of learning and the development of new fields of study, the influence of technological development in learning devices and resource tools, and the growing pressure for community involvement and new forms of teaching have, of course, only aggravated the problem. It is becoming more and more costly for individual institutions to continue to seek to be self-sufficient educational units capable of meeting the full range of needs of their students without help from other institutions of higher education.

Among the principle fields of cooperation reported by the institutions surveyed were: Administrative and business services (e.g., joint purchasing, sharing of computer services, management information exchange); enrollment and admissions (e.g., cooperative recruiting, simplification of application and financial aid procedures, relaxation of transfer requirements); educational programs (sharing new program development, elimination of course duplication, facilities sharing); libraries (union catalogs, cooperative purchasing, interinstitutional loans); student services (joint health services, cooperative extra-curricular programs); faculty exchange (traveling faculty, joint appointments); and community services (off-campus continuing education, urban research and services). Although the Academy's survey confirmed the fact that there is still a large gap between present efforts and the potential for cooperation, it identified a wide variety of programs and institutions for which the benefits of cooperation clearly outweigh the difficulties.

For the purposes of this study, we found it useful to examine several examples of interinstitutional cooperation at first hand -- to go beyond survey data to learn more about the strengths and weaknesses of such arrangements and to relate their experience to the potential for greater cooperation in California. We visited three of the strongest consortia in the country -- the Five Colleges in Amherst, Massachusetts; the Worcester Consortium in Worcester, Massachusetts; and the Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium in Dayton, Ohio. We also met with state officials in New York and Illinois, where there is strong interest not only in consortia but also in regional organizations to promote interinstitutional cooperation and decentralized state administration of higher education.

The Five Colleges

The Five Colleges are Amherst, Smith, Mt. Holyoke, the University of Massachusetts (in Amherst), and Hampshire College, all of which are located in the Connecticut River Valley within 12 miles of one another. Amherst, Smith, and Mt. Holyoke have a long history of cooperation, but their first formal cooperative action occurred in 1951 when they agreed to establish the Hampshire Inter-Library Center as a central depository for little-used books and periodicals. In 1957, the four existing institutions (Hampshire had not yet been founded) appointed a coordinator of cooperative programs, and in 1965 a cooperative corporation was formed to administer the cross-registration of students, development of a joint astronomy department, several cooperative area studies programs, a radio station, cooperative doctoral programs, and an initial effort to encourage a limited exchange of faculty.

Several years earlier, in 1958, it had been proposed that the four institutions join to establish a fifth, an experimental college which would borrow prestige and experience from the other four. In 1970 this proposal came to fruition with the opening of Hampshire College. The new college provides a program of inter-disciplinary and self-directed undergraduate study which is divided into three divisions through which each student may pass, largely at his or her own pace. Hampshire College clearly ranks as an outstanding example of what can be accomplished through cooperative effort, not so much in effecting savings but in expanding educational opportunity with maximum effectiveness.

In 1968, the presidents of the five institutions appointed a Long Range Planning Committee to study and evaluate existing cooperative arrangements among the five campuses, suggest new long-range goals for further cooperation, and recommend the means of achieving those goals. When the committee presented its report the following year, it called for, among other things, a further expansion of faculty exchange programs, formation of interinstitutional councils for Black studies, a broadening of student cross-registration, adoption of a common academic calendar, and closer cooperation in program and capital outlay planning. Most of these recommendations have now been carried out, as the five institutions have continued to expand their cooperative efforts.

Probably the most noteworthy achievement of the last few years has been an agreement that the deans of each institution before hiring new faculty, will review the capabilities of the other four institutions in the particular field, to see whether their students might be better served by

enrolling in classes at another campus. Thus the Five Colleges have succeeded in extending interinstitutional cooperation to the heart of institutional decision-making. They have also given strong encouragement to regular meetings of faculty and academic administrators as a way of developing and stimulating new areas of cooperation. Dr. North Burn, the Five Colleges director, says that the five institutions are just beginning to "break through the crust" in relation to what is possible for them, but it is clearly evident that the Five Colleges represent one of the most advanced arrangements for interinstitutional cooperation to be found anywhere in the country.

The Worcester Consortium

The Worcester Consortium for Higher Education is made up of eleven institutions of higher education, including four union colleges, two small Catholic colleges, two small private universities, a state college, a polytechnic college, and a medical school, located in and around Worcester, Massachusetts.[3] In addition to the regular members, there are nine "associated" institutions: an art museum, an historical society, and a biological research center, among others. The consortium was founded in 1967 for the purpose of increasing the variety and range of educational offerings for students through cross-registration and joint faculty appointments, to expand continuing education and community services in the Worcester area, and to enable the member institutions "to work cooperatively on programs that save money." In 1970, a full-time director was appointed to administer the various cooperative programs, develop new opportunities for cooperation, and help raise outside support for consortium projects.

In contrast to the Five Colleges, but much more in the pattern of most other multipurpose consortia, the Worcester Consortium is highly project-oriented. For example, it is deeply involved in a federally funded model cities program in Worcester, it operates a small FM radio station,

3. The members are: Anna Maria College, Assumption College, Becker Union College, Clark University, College of the Holy Cross, Leicester Junior College, Quinsagimond Community College, University of Massachusetts Medical School, Worcester Junior College, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, and Worcester State College. Associate members are: American Antiquarian Society, Craft Center, Old Sturbridge Village, International Center of Worcester, Worcester Art Museum, Worcester County Horticultural Society, Worcester Foundation for Experimental Biology, Worcester Historical Society, and Worcester Science Center.

it is engaged in increasing the Spanish language competence of Worcester public school teachers, and it operates a student/staff volunteer tutoring and counseling program in the Worcester public schools and neighborhood centers. It also provides for joint purchasing for certain institutional supplies and equipment, supervises the operation of the Worcester Area Colleges Computation Center, and administers an inter-library loan system. In addition, a cross-registration system has been established for students of the member institutions, enabling students at one college to register for courses at another member college in such fields as computer technology, Russian, oceanography, and urban geography. Several of the members have established joint curricula (e.g., Clark and Worcester Polytechnic have established a joint biomedical engineering program; Assumption, Clark, and Holy Cross offer a joint theater arts program, and a system of joint faculty appointments has been started in linguistics, Black studies, and film studies.

The presidents of the member institutions meet monthly, and the other principal officers also meet frequently to discuss matters of mutual interest. However, the principal support for the consortium comes from the two or three presidents who have been the strongest advocates of interinstitutional cooperation in the Worcester area from the outset. It remains to be seen whether this will be enough to enable the consortium to continue to grow and to eventually bring the member institutions together in much more fundamental ways. As elsewhere, it has been easier for the member institutions to cooperate in the development of new projects and programs, and especially those which have been funded in large part from external sources (foundations, the federal government), than to work to make the best use of their existing strengths and weaknesses. Yet the Worcester Corporation is clearly one of the most active and promising consortia to be found anywhere in the country, and one which should provide a valuable yardstick with which to measure the effectiveness of consortia as devices for expanding educational opportunity at a minimum cost in scarce financial and personnel resources.

Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium

The Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium was established in 1967 to achieve "educational advancement, research development, and administrative efficiency for its member colleges and universities and affiliated research-oriented industries." It has perhaps the most diverse membership of any active consortium. Its members range in size from 400 to more than 10,000 students and include two state universities, a public community college, a public technical institute, one private

college, six church-related colleges and universities, and a federal institute.[4] As in the case of the Worcester Consortium, there are also a number of associate members, principally private research facilities. All members are located within a 35-mile radius.

The consortium, which incorporated as a nonprofit educational association, is governed by a board consisting of the presidents of the member institutions, three trustees from private industry and research, and two public representatives. The activities of the consortium are supervised by a full-time director. Members contribute approximately ten per cent of the consortium's annual budget of $500,000; the rest comes from contributions from associate members and external sources.

A limited cross-registration system has been established, enabling full-time students to enroll in courses offered by member institutions on a space available basis (with permission of the receiving institution) at no additional charge. Because of the newness of the program, the distance between many of the members, the lack of a common calendar, and other restrictions, however, only about one per cent of the consortium's 30,000 students now make use of the cross-registration opportunity. As is the case with nearly every other consortium, traditional desire for institutional autonomy has so far blocked real progress toward effective cooperation in basic educational programs; most of the consortium's activities involve marginal new fields of interest in which the availability of outside funding is an important element in encouraging cooperative efforts. As yet, the basic instructional programs of the member institutions have been little affected by the consortium.

Among the consortium's principal achievements have been the establishment of a training institute for the model cities program in Dayton; creation of a public opinion center, also as part of the model cities program; the staging of forums on education and community problems;

---

4. The regular members are: Air Force Institute of Technology, Antioch College, Cedarville College, Central State University, Clark Technical College, University of Dayton, Sinclair Community College, Urbana College, Wilberforce University, Wilmington College, Wittenberg University, Wright State University, and the Dayton Art Institute. Associate members are: Cox Heart Institute, Engineering and Science Institute of Dayton, Frigidaire Division of GMS, Charles F. Kettering Foundation, Monsanto Research Corporation, National Cash Register Company, and the Model Cities Planning Council of Dayton.

administration of a VISTA project in Dayton; and various projects designed to bring together faculty and others interested in specific fields of current interest, (e.g., Black studies and China studies). At present, the consortium director is engaged in promoting the establishment of a joint program in the technology of packaging (involving three campuses) and the development of a new "educational park" which will in time serve as the headquarters for the consortium, provide shared research and library facilities for consortium members and, it is hoped, be of particular interest to research-oriented industry in the Dayton-Miami Valley area.

In a recent report to the DMVC board, the director, Dr. Charles J. Armstrong, mentioned these and other achievements, but also noted the lack of progress in the "much more critical area of cooperative academic planning."[5] Cooperative planning, he pointed out, must take into account the relative strengths and weaknesses of the member institutions, "with a commitment on the part of all to capitalize on these strengths and to minimize these weaknesses by a genuine sharing of such academic assets." Going on, Dr. Armstrong told his board:

> For example, it simply does not seem sensible that in a number of our smaller institutions, upper division courses and programs are maintained for a handful of students on each campus, while at the same time these courses and programs are essentially the same on all campuses. Yet this kind of realistic planning is almost impossible to achieve, even though we have had almost universal agreement throughout the Consortium from presidents, academic deans, department chairmen, and faculty, that the concept is basically a good one.
>
> The resistance comes when the planning targets in on specific areas or departments. The possible elimination of certain departmental majors or even of entire upper division course offerings in certain areas, with student needs being met by other cooperating institutional members, poses what is conceived to be a threat which few faculty members are willing to face. There

---

5. Memo to Members of the Board of Trustees of Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium from Dr. Charles J. Armstrong, October 6, 1972.

is also, I suspect, an element of institutional prestige involved.

The Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium seems just now to have reached the point from which it must either move toward more solid accomplishments or accept the fact that it will only be effective at the margins of its members' instructional programs, without really making a significant impact on the allocation of their resources.

New York

Several relatively strong multipurpose consortia have been established in New York State -- in Albany, Potsdam, Poughkeepsie, and the Finger Lakes area -- but the most interesting development at present is the effort to establish regional units which will help to pull together the planning and administration of all the various higher education resources within each of the state's major regions.

Although there has been some interest in regional organization in New York for a number of years, both as a means of decentralizing the rapidly growing State University of New York, and as a way of strengthening the state's private institutions, the movement received its strongest impetus in 1970, according to state officials, when Governor Rockefeller issued an executive order calling upon all state agencies to establish regional units for their planning, operation, and fiscal management.[6] The Regents of the University of the State of New York, who, with the State Education Department, are responsible for administration of higher education, public and private, throughout the state, quickly developed a plan for dividing the state into eight regions, each encompassing a substantial total enrollment and a full range of institutions, from two-year colleges through one or more public or private universities offering doctoral training. The regional boundaries were also drawn to coincide closely with the regions employed by other state agencies so as to facilitate cooperation between educational institutions and other public services in each region.

The Regents' plan calls for the voluntary establishment of an advisory council for each region to be formed, in most cases, from existing consortia and to be made up

---

6. A plan for the regional organization of the State University of New York was an important issue in 1964-67, but was successfully opposed by those SUNY campuses that feared it would lead to tighter controls.

primarily of the presidents of the colleges and universities of the region. The regional councils are to guide the development and operation of regional activities, which are to include such things as the measurement of the long-range enrollment potential of each region, development of cross-registration policies and procedures, studies of opportunities for the joint utilization of facilities, and cooperative educational planning involving both public and private institutions.

Three regional advisory councils have been established, of which the first and most advanced is the New York City council. The New York City council was established in September 1971 and this June completed its first regional plan calling for the creation of a permanent New York City Regional Coordinating Council for Post-Secondary Education, a coordinated admissions program, developing methods of assuring full utilization of available educational resources (including libraries and other major facilities), the development of professional programs and graduate studies, and cooperative programs for disadvantaged students.[7] The New York Council has also undertaken the first regional study of the demand for higher education and is now attempting to deal with the problem of selecting the best location for a proposed new business administration college.

Regionalism is now to be encouraged by the Regents on a "gradual and voluntary basis" over the next several years. At the last session of the New York Legislature, the Regents sought an appropriation of $450,000 to be allocated among the regional councils to pay for staff and proposed regional projects (and to encourage their formation). The request was denied, but it will be repeated in 1973. If these funds are not forthcoming, it is possible that the initiative for regional organization will shift from the Regents (who have long been closely allied with the State's private colleges and universities) to the State University of New York. SUNY, which was established in 1948, consists of 67 institutions, including all public colleges and universities outside New York City, plus four institutions within the city. SUNY is also a strong supporter of regionalism and has developed its own structure for regional planning and administration of the SUNY institutions. The regional structure set up by SUNY consists of four, rather than eight, regions, each of which incorporates two of the Regents' regions and is centered about a public doctoral degree-granting university.

---

7. A Regional Plan for Higher Education, Report from New York City, Regents Advisory Council, New York City, June 1972.

Although the Department of Education and SUNY officials are cooperating closely in the development of their alternative regional systems, it seems evident that one or the other must prevail. It is not clear, however, which has the best chance. The Regents now act as the principal state coordinating body for higher education and are expected to be designated as the state agency for administration of federal programs under the recently enacted amendments to the Higher Education Act. Nevertheless, SUNY has enjoyed a particularly close relationship to the Governor and has the funds necessary to put its plan into effect (as it has begun to do) without making a special request of the Legislature. Moreover, SUNY Chancellor Ernest L. Boyer is one of the state's strongest advocates of regionalism and appears to be pushing hard for reorganization of SUNY administration along regional lines.[8]

However this conflict is resolved, it is apparent that regional cooperation is gaining rapidly in popularity in New York and that, in this respect, New York has clearly taken the lead among the other states in fostering interinstitutional cooperation.

Illinois

There is also considerable interest in regionalism as a means of encouraging interinstitutional cooperation in Illinois, which now has a relatively strong, unified system of public higher education under the direction of the State Board of Higher Education. In Illinois' case, however, much of the interest in regionalism is closely related to efforts to expand non-traditional forms of higher education. In Phase III of the Master Plan for Higher Education in Illinois, the Board of Higher Education, noting the need for "new patterns of education and new delivery systems," as well as for greater coordination of effort so as to take full advantage of the great variety of resources available within the state's higher education system, called for establishment of a Collegiate Common Market to utilize "the total resources of higher education, public and private." Explaining what it meant by this, the board said:

A Collegiate Common Market emerges initially

---

8. "Regionalism and Interinstitutional Cooperation," an address by Ernest L. Boyer, Chancellor, State University of New York, delivered at Eighth Annual Regents Conference on the Leadership Role of the Trustee, New York, N. Y., February 10, 1972.

> with regional possibilities, but it has statewide potential . . . . A Collegiate Common Market is one mechanism for the operation of the integrated system. It does not suggest that individual colleges and universities yield their local and particular distinctions. In fact, it is the considerable diversity among Illinois institutions that makes the state an attractive arena for an operative common market. The fact that different institutions do different things well and no institution does all things superlatively makes it appropriate to develop one educational marketplace among the many campuses.
>
> Inherent to the common market concept is the diminution of traditional barriers among the institutions. It can also be the vehicle for the university-without-walls pattern which calls for, among other things, an ease of transfer among campuses and the development of new criteria for the evaluation of an individual's educational progress. Ideally, the student in the Illinois integrated system, whatever his age, whatever his educational background, would have access to the resources of the entire system. The quality of his experience would be appreciably enhanced, in these days of technological marvels, by exposure to a thoroughly comprehensive system.[9]

The board went on to list a number of ways of accomplishing this objective (faculty and facility sharing, interlibrary loans, inter-campus health services, etc.) and to recommend establishment of a task force to recommend implementation of a Collegiate Common Market "that utilizes the existing and developing resources of the public and private sectors to broaden and maximize educational opportunities and reduce duplication." The task force was specifically directed to consider "as one possible alternative mechanism, the establishment of regional councils." While this study was in progress, the Illinois Legislature passed a resolution directing the state board to "foster and support" interinstitutional programs and activities across the state and appropriated $350,000 to be allocated by the board for that purpose.

---

9. A Master Plan - Phase III, The Illinois Board of Higher Education, May 1971, pp. 11-16.

In June of this year the CCM task force submitted two principal recommendations. The first calls for creation of a new "non-campus, non-traditional" university for the State of Illinois, with associated regional centers, to increase access to post-secondary education, to provide alternative methods for earning degrees, and to foster interinstitutional cooperation on a statewide basis. The second calls for establishment of "voluntary regional councils among existing institutions in Illinois in order to promote interinstitutional cooperation at the post-secondary level on a regional basis, to encourage the development of new programs and methods within and among existing institutions for increasing access to post-secondary education, and to assist in meeting the objectives of the new non-traditional, non-resident university."

According to the board's staff, the new non-traditional university, to be called Lincoln State University, will soon be chartered as a separate institution, without a campus of its own but operated through six regional councils which will be responsible for coordinating access to all forms of non-traditional education in their regions. These councils will also be encouraged to aid in the development of consortia and other cooperative arrangements in their regions, but their principal responsibility will be to develop "open university" programs.

Conclusion

It seems clear from all available evidence that the movement toward greater interinstitutional cooperation is gathering momentum in many states, and particularly in the East and Midwest. Where there is a strong tradition of and commitment to cooperative efforts, consortia have proven to be useful devices for formalizing and encouraging the continuing development of cooperative programs. Nevertheless, agreement to establish a consortium does not necessarily indicate agreement to enter into the sort of joint venture which will have a major impact on the manner in which the resources of the participating institutions will be allocated. There is substantial evidence, indeed, that, except in very special circumstances, consortia and other similar arrangements have a limited value in fostering truly effective interinstitutional cooperation.

For this reason, the growing interest in regional alignments in at least two major states (several other eastern states are also beginning to show an interest) may be of much greater importance. Educators and state officials in New York and Illinois appear to believe that regional structures will permit the public and private institutions

in their states not only to make better use of their resources but to operate with greater flexibility and initiative within a decentralized statewide system of coordinated planning and management. Developments in these two states should be of continuing interest to legislators, educators, and others in California who seek to strengthen cooperation and coordination among this state's institutions of higher education.

5. OBSTACLES TO INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION

The results of our survey of present arrangements for interinstitutional cooperation among California institutions of higher education make it clear that there are several important obstacles to such cooperation. It would be very remarkable, indeed, if that were not so, for it is evident from experience elsewhere that efforts to expand interinstitutional cooperation have everywhere found substantial opposition.

Seven years ago, James C. Messersmith, writing in a volume edited by Logan Wilson titled, Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, described the basic obstacles to interinstitutional cooperation in these words:

> In the past, it was practically possible and perhaps educationally advantageous for colleges to operate unilaterally, each determining its own purposes, goals, and programs and promoting its own resources. This unilateralism was particularly influenced by three factors: (1) the ivory tower concept, which set colleges apart from the community; (2) the self-sufficient concept, which separated them from one another; and (3) the highly selective nature of single-purpose programs, which drew relatively few students to any one institution. Frequently, both the need and the desire to establish cooperative programs were lacking. Where the need existed, the benefits and potentialities of such undertakings were not always clearly envisioned.[1]

---

1. Emerging Patterns in American Higher Education, Logan Wilson (Ed.), Washington, D.C., American Council on Education, 1965.

Thus the principal obstacle to cooperation in California as in other states is the traditional emphasis upon the unified, comprehensive campus which attempts to meet the full range of instructional and co-curricular needs of its students and works hard to develop strong campus loyalty among students, faculty, and administrators, alike. Too often, proposals for cooperation are seen as threats to institutional prestige and status. As Algo Henderson has observed:

> Each institution has an image that relates to its position in the hierarchical pyramid of recognition. The institution that perceives itself to be high in "standards" and quality is always apprehensive about any move that might adulterate its position. It hesitates to admit students that are below its own students in quality or in achievement. Departmental faculties do not readily accept exchange teachers who seem to them not to be on a par in quality with their own membership.
>
> The institution that is junior in relationship, on the other hand, may be defensive about its work and may feel sensitive if the plan is not of mutual interest. The tendency of the large university is to make of the contract a "project" as though it were part of the extension services of the university. This arrangement can lead to a minimal offering of discrete services instead of general transfusion. And the junior institution may find its position psychologically unacceptable.[2]

Fritz Grupe argues that this traditional pattern of institutional insularity must be taken into account in setting up and administering cooperative arrangements:

> The term "interinstitutional cooperation" may be especially inappropriate, if it is taken to imply that institutional personnel must harbor feelings of altruistic and selfless unconcern for their own colleges' welfare. This rarely occurs.

---

2. Algo D. Henderson, "Implications for Administration Arising from the Growing Interdependence of Colleges and Universities," Interinstitutional Cooperation in Higher Education, Lawrence C. Howard (Ed.), 1967, p. 249.

> The historical insularity of institutions of higher education and their deliberately distinctive nature prevents such a phenomenon in most collectivities regardless of how rational and welcome such a development might at times appear to be. Self-sufficiency has been the watchword for too long a time to be abandoned easily. Monetary and academic incentives still function to support an institutional perspective in demanding ways. It would be far more accurate and useful to assume that cooperative programs have been and will for the foreseeable future continue to be thought of as techniques for competing by other means. A change in this posture, if it comes at all, will occur only after substantial amounts of both self-righteous foot dragging and quite proper protest. It can be expected that for each consortium created, the primary orientation of the faculty and administrators and, no doubt, the students as well, will remain institutionally introspective. Cooperation often will be pictured as something the other fellows will do when they come around to one's own way of thinking. Institutional personnel creating consortia are usually expecting the impossible, not the inevitable, if they assume that the situation will be otherwise. In this regard programs that strengthen existing departments will be accepted readily, but programs that require the elimination of departments are likely to languish without support.[3]

These are the basic obstacles which must be overcome nearly everywhere. In California, there are additional barriers, the most important of which is the segmental organization of public higher education. Despite the obvious need for coordination, each of the three public systems, and especially UC and CSUC, has sought to become a self-sufficient system that can be operated, planned, and developed with a minimum of concern for what the other two segments are doing. Although our survey has revealed several examples of cooperation between CSUC campuses and one or more community colleges and between UC campuses and one or more community colleges, there are very few examples of cooperation between UC and CSUC campuses.

The 1960 Master Plan has been credited with doing

---

3. Grupe, op. cit., p. 752-753.

much to develop coordination and cooperation among California's institutions of higher education, but it has done little to encourage interinstitutional cooperation in the planning and implementation of educational programs. A 1970 study of higher education planning in four major states by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education in Berkeley came to this same conclusion. Focusing particularly on the University of California, the authors reported a "relative neglect of cooperative or joint academic programming" among the UC campuses and between the university and other public and private institutions in California.

> Some efforts have been made to ease the transfer of students from one university campus to another, and to share library, computer, laboratory, health services, and athletic, recreational, and cultural facilities. However, with the exception of the Education Abroad Program and the offerings of the University Extension, there were no major joint academic programs involving the mutual sharing of personnel and financial resources. Nothing was found within the University of California's structure which demonstrated innovative joint programming.[4]

Indeed, it appears that an important reason why interinstitutional cooperation has been more successful in other states is that they do not have the same sharply defined "tripartite" public system that has developed in California. Public institutions of all kinds which serve a single metropolitan area or region can cooperate if they want to without being bound by or threatening to disrupt segmental lines of authority and loyalty.[5]

---

4. Ernest G. Palola, Timothy Lehrmann, William R. Blischke, Higher Education by Design: The Sociology of Planning, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education; Berkeley, Calif. 1970, p. 131.

5. It may also be significant that California ranks well behind many other states in the development of regional government. In local government as in higher education, there continues to be a strong emphasis upon jurisdictional autonomy and strong opposition to anything which appears to threaten "local autonomy."

California's segmental structure is strongly reinforced, of course, by the state system of financing, which first allocates available funds to each of the three public segments and then to the individual campuses within each segment (or individual districts in the case of the community colleges). There is no incentive within this system for intersegmental cooperation -- just the opposite, as has been demonstrated in the attempt to establish joint doctoral programs involving a CSUC and a UC campus without altering the segmental system of funding.

It is only in the case of certain federal funds administered by the Coordinating Council for Higher Education that the segmental barriers are readily overcome. The Council has rarely used these funds, however, for the specific purpose of encouraging interinstitutional cooperation and in most cases the funds themselves are too limited to be used as a continuing source of support for cooperative arrangements. The Northeastern California Higher Education Study is a significant exception and an example of what might be begun with additional funding of this nature.[6]

Within each segment, also, the emphasis in budgeting is upon individual institutions and administrative units rather than upon educational programs. Although there are important efforts to assign certain high cost programs to specific campuses within each segment (or colleges in the case of multi-campus community college districts), in general all the incentives are for each campus to develop as full a range of services as its funding permits and not to devote any significant portion of its resources to developing joint programs with neighboring institutions.

---

6. Among other things, this study has led to the creation of the Northern California Area Planning Council for Educational programs, an organization now made up of six community colleges in the area and California State University, Chico. The participants in the study have recommended it be "the instrument through which continued cooperation and collaboration between the northeastern California institutions of higher education on matters of mutual interest and concern can be facilitated."

   Summary of Findings and Recommendations, Northeastern California Higher Educational Study, Coordinating Council for Higher Education, Agenda for April 1972.

It is entirely possible, also, that the tight budgets with which nearly all California institutions of higher education have had to live in recent years may have worked to discourage the development of cooperative programs. There is some evidence suggesting that there is greater receptivity for cooperative endeavors when the participants have uncommitted resources which they can allocate to such efforts. When the faculty and administrators believe their campus to be overcrowded and underfunded, they understandably find it difficult to seriously consider sharing their crowded space or spending scarce funds on joint projects of uncertain benefits to their campus.[7] Nevertheless, it is also true that the common denominator of cooperative programs across the state (as well as for higher education generally) is financial stringency. Tight budgets, which cannot be stretched to cover the full cost of desirable new programs or which demand economies in campus administration and services, have provided a strong incentive for campuses to join together to do what they cannot do, or cannot do as cheaply, separately. Although it is often emphasized that cooperative efforts must be aimed at more than just saving money if they are to be successful, those that administer such programs readily acknowledge that the initial impetus for such cooperation is nearly always a desire to cut costs, whether by reducing the expense of existing services (rarely) or by spreading the cost of new programs.

Finally, it is undoubtedly true that simply because there is so little formal cooperative effort on a substantial scale, it is impossible at this point to prove its effectiveness either in expanding educational opportunities or in effecting significant cost savings. Even in those areas where some experience has been gained -- e.g., television broadcasting, computer sharing networks, extension programs -- there is little or no data with which to demonstrate the success or failure of cooperative arrangements. As indicated in the response to our survey, more than a few institutions are highly skeptical of the advertised savings to be obtained under various cooperative arrangements.

---

7. There is also some indication that with the slowdown and in some cases the end of enrollment growth, some public institutions have gone back to competing with one another to recruit new students instead of cooperating in attempting to meet students' needs.

Past and Present Efforts to Increase Cooperation

There have been several proposals over the past several decades for encouraging greater interinstitutional cooperation on a statewide basis in California, but for the most part these proposals have had little success. The 1960 Master Plan, of course, put great emphasis upon the potential role of the proposed new coordinating council as a device for reducing intersegmental rivalries. In addition, it recommended continuation and strengthening of the State Advisory Committee on Adult Education (established in 1944 and reactivated in 1953) as a device for reducing unnecessary overlapping and duplication of adult education offerings by the four segments. Although this recommendation was carried out, lack of interest among the segments led to the eventual abandonment of the committee.

Perhaps the most ambitious proposal for interinstitutional cooperation was advanced in the staff report prepared for the Joint Committee on Higher Education in early 1969 which expressed strong criticism of the existing structure of public higher education and proposed a thorough reorganization, unifying the three public systems at the state level and establishing subordinate regional units to coordinate all public and private higher education within seven regions.[8] The proposal called for a single governing board to be assigned statewide responsibility for general governance of the unified system, allocation of state and federal appropriations, and development of long-range programs and fiscal planning. Each region was also to have an administrative and coordinating body with responsiblity for focusing the public and private higher education resources on the needs of the region and for monitoring the implementation of statewide and regional policies. The declared purposes of this reorganization were to eliminate the organizational barriers between the University of California campuses, the state colleges, and the community colleges; to give greater operational freedom to the individual institutions; to encourage continuous and comprehensive planning, financing, and evaluation; and to permit the Legislature to delegate greater authority for allocating state funds among the various institutions. This proposal was drafted as legislation and introduced in the 1969 and 1970 sessions of the Legislature but failed to attract much support, and its provisions have remained untested.

---

8. The Challenge of Achievement, Joint Committee on Higher Education, California Legislature, Sacramento, 1969.

In 1970, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education commissioned and published a study of facilities sharing among the state's institutions of higher education that produced a series of recommended steps for encouraging such sharing.[9] Although the Council itself has done nothing to implement those recommendations, the Legislature this year accepted the following recommendation of the Legislative Analyst, based on the Council's study:

> The University of California, the California State Colleges, and the California Community Colleges (should) review the feasibility of cooperative arrangements as a major criterion in the capital outlay project approval process. All three segments shall develop and report their plans for increased inter-institutional use of facilities to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education.

Another legislative action which is credited with having had a direct impact on the potential for cooperative efforts in the fields of instructional television and data processing, was passage of AB1171 in 1970, permitting community colleges to count enrollment (for apportionment purposes) in classes which are supervised by an accredited staff member but do not necessarily require the staff member's presence. Community College officials say that this statutory provision has given great impetus to the development of instructional television consortia linking the two-year colleges in several metropolitan and rural areas. Some of these officials have expressed concern, however, as to the potential impact of SB95 (Alquist) of the current session, which, among other things, credits attendance to the district of enrollment rather than the district of residence. If adopted, they say, this provision will strongly discourage inter-district attendance agreements.

The Coordinating Council has begun to effect a significant strengthening in coordinated statewide educational standards through its special studies of engineering, marine sciences, agriculture, and criminal justice programs in relation to regional and statewide manpower needs and student demand. Two other important studies have dealt with the appropriate allocation of high-cost instructional programs and efficiency in graduate education. And in March 1971, in what

---

9. Facility Sharing Among Institutions of Higher Education in California, Council Report 71-7, Coordinating Council for Higher Education, July 1971.

it termed "a milestone in statewide higher education planning in California" the Council approved a statement defining its role in the review of academic plans and programs. According to this statement, the two four-year segments have developed mutually agreeable lists of core programs and a system for submitting and reviewing proposed new programs outside these core areas.

Most recently, the Coordinating Council's Select Committee on the Master Plan has recommended that the state -- and the Council in particular -- encourage "by a variety of means" the creation of regional intersegmental consortia to develop programs for the cross-registration of students, continuing education, facilities sharing, instructional television, challenge examination, and internship programs.[10]

---

10. The recommendation, as adopted by the Select Committee, is as follows (pp. 18-19, Preliminary Report, October 1972):

> The State should encourage by a variety of means the establishment of regional consortia of different types and the Coordinating Council is urged to fulfill its advisory role as a catalyst, an informational clearinghouse, and an agency to assist in the development of new and existing consortia.
>
> a) Such consortia should have an intersegmental board to develop policy proposals to the respective boards and to coordinate and administer segmental policies for cross-registration of students, for adult continuing education programs, and for facilities utilization (including public libraries and facilities of private businesses and other organizations).
>
> b) The consortia should also establish a television division to develop production of academic instructional films and tapes, to develop contracts and procedures for utilizing commercial television facilities and broadcasting in the instructional process, and to coordinate the offering of televised and correspondence instruction for appropriate academic credit by member institutions.
>
> c) The consortia should also organize testing and evaluation centers for administering challenge examinations for credit, arrange for independent

study and internship experience, develop cooperative and "on-the-job" programs and other educational experiences, and organize on-site instruction in business facilities in the region. In general, the consortia should place high priority on developing and utilizing community resources.

6. WAYS IN WHICH THE LEGISLATURE MAY ENCOURAGE GREATER INTERINSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION IN CALIFORNIA

Despite the substantial obstacles to interinstitutional cooperation among California's institutions of public and private education, there is considerable evidence of a strong interest in cooperative effort when it can be related to specific institutional objectives or the interest of key individuals and that the obstacles can be overcome where the will to do so is strong enough. It is also evident, however, that there is very limited interest in cooperation for cooperation's sake and that even when the potential benefits seem obvious from the outside, those on the inside (campus administrators, faculty, students) who are more acutely aware of the difficulties facing effective interinstitutional cooperation are likely to be unimpressed.

Thus, if the Legislature or any other agency is to attempt to encourage greater cooperation -- and especially cooperative activity that crosses segmental lines -- then it must answer, in advance, the question: "Cooperation for what?"

In general, the answer to this question will be either to accomplish certain specific and limited objectives which can be accomplished without significantly altering the existing organizational framework, or to facilitate cooperation across the whole range of institutional functions. As examples of cooperative effort to accomplish specific and limited objectives, one might list such things as intercampus library loan systems intended to reduce library collection costs, development of computer networks to make efficient use of high cost computer equipment, and cooperative planning of extension programs to avoid unnecessary duplication of course offerings. These objectives have in common the fact that they can all be accomplished through consortia and other

common cooperative devices without significantly altering the existing segmental structure. But to go beyond this, to develop and promote regional cooperation in a wide variety of primary and secondary activities, will require the creation of a new structure to link together the individual campuses in each region and to serve, if necessary, as a catalyst for cooperative effort.

If the objective is the more limited one, then we suggest the following actions for consideration by the Legislature.

1. The state planning agency should be directed to sponsor an annual series of regional workshops on interinstitutional cooperation to give the chief executive officers of the public and private institutions within each region a regular opportunity to discuss and plan ways of increasing cooperative arrangements among their institutions.[1]

One of the greatest obstacles to cooperation at present is simply the fact that nearly all program planning and administration takes place within the context of individual campuses. If there is to be a substantial increase in interinstitutional cooperation, voluntarily or involuntarily, it is clear that those who are most directly affected will have to be given an opportunity to discuss among themselves the potential benefits of working with more than one campus and the ways by which they can overcome the principal obstacles to cooperative programs. Thus we propose that a series of regional conferences or workshops be held, bringing together representatives of all the public and private

1. In the following recommendations we refer to the "state planning agency" rather than the Coordinating Council for Higher Education or any specific alternative agency. The members of the advisory committee as well as many others with whom we have discussed the matter in the course of this study, have suggested that there is sufficient opposition to giving the Council additional powers -- either because it is not designed to use those powers effectively or out of a fear that it is attempting to develop programs of its own which are not closely related to its central coordinating function, or both -- that it would jeopardize fair consideration of our recommendations if they were tied to the Council in any way.

campuses in each region. The purpose of these meetings would be to permit and encourage an open discussion of the common interests of the institutions and an examination of ways in which those institutions might work cooperatively to better serve their regions.

All chief executive officers of the institutions within each region should be encouraged to attend, for they are the ones who have it in their power to give cooperative efforts the backing they need. There are others, however, who might also be asked to participate; for example: interested faculty, student representatives, individuals in charge of various campus services (libraries, computer centers, etc.), directors of non-academic community facilities such as museums, performing arts centers, and nonprofit research centers, and interested community leaders.

Much could be learned about how such workshops should be organized and conducted, we believe, by convening three or four experimental workshops, each sponsored by a four-year institution in those areas in which there is already some evidence of interest in regional cooperation. For example, an experimental workshop in regional cooperation might be convened by UC Berkeley for the San Francisco Bay Area, by California State University, San Diego for the San Diego metropolitan area, by UC Davis for the Sacramento area, etc. We also believe that there is little purpose to be served by attempting to draw hard and fast regional boundaries, and certainly not at the outset. The regions should conform broadly with the patterns of regionalism in government and other activities that are developing in some parts of California. Every region should include one large four-year institution and several community colleges, and consideration should be given to regional boundaries adopted by state agencies in other fields, but otherwise individual institutions should be encouraged to place themselves according to their dominant interests and service areas.

The cost of conducting these workshops, which should become regular annual planning sessions for regional cooperation, may be met from federal planning funds authorized for allocation to state planning commissions under the Education Amendments of 1972 or, if such funds are not forthcoming, from a special state appropriation to the planning agency for this purpose.

2. The Legislature should consider initiating a pilot program of appropriations for core support for regional consortia and similar cooperative arrangements in several areas of the state. Such funds might either go directly to the cooperative agencies or be appropriated to the state planning

agency to be reallocated to the cooperating institutions; if recommendation #1 is implemented, then this assistance should be linked to cooperative programs developed by the regional workshops.

As noted in Section 5 of this report, the existing system of support for higher education discourages rather than encourages cooperative activities and programs. To change this, it will probably be necessary to make funds available directly for the support of cooperative endeavors. It would be a mistake, however, for the Legislature simply to fund individual cooperative projects, rather than the organizational structures which make it possible for the institutions to participate with their own funds in a wide range of projects. Otherwise the Legislature is likely to find itself supporting a broad array of projects which have a marginal impact, at most, on the participating institutions and which are chosen because they have failed to gain sufficient backing for funding through the regular institutional budgets. Project by project funding is not likely to produce useful information about the real potential for interinstitutional cooperation, nor to encourage the sort of multipurpose planning which alone will significantly influence the manner in which educational resources are deployed.

Although it may be possible for the Legislature to select for itself those organizations or arrangements which should receive support, it will probably be more productive in the long run to involve the state planning agency directly in selecting and monitoring such arrangements, and in this way to give greater meaning to the regional workshops.

3. In conducting its annual review of higher education budgets, the Legislature's fiscal committees should give particular attention to proposed and potential cooperative activities and programs which have promise of conserving scarce resources and achieving maximum educational benefits, and especially those which cross segmental lines.

The annual budget review process presents the Legislature with one of its best opportunities for effecting important changes in the administration of higher education. Unfortunately, this opportunity has been little used to promote cooperation among the segments in the planning and implementation of their programs, although it has frequently been used to encourage intrasegmental cooperation and coordination. Rather than continuing to treat the three public segments of higher education as separate agencies with little relationship to one another (and largely ignoring the private

institutions except as they request increases in the state student financial aid programs), the two fiscal committees should, whenever appropriate, encourage the representatives of the public segments to consider themselves as representatives of higher education generally.

To do this it may be necessary for the legislators themselves to redirect their methods of budgetary review, placing less emphasis upon the administration of programs and institutions within each segment and more on the planning and administration of programs inter-segmentally. For example, the Legislature might add to its concern for the development of separate programs intended to increase access to the University of California, the California State University and Colleges, and the California Community Colleges for minority and low income students,a genuine interest in encouraging the development and management of cooperative programs by all three (or four) segments in relation to the general problem of providing full access to higher education everywhere in the state. Efforts to follow students through different levels of the system so as to evaluate effectivness of transfer programs should be supported. The development of library resources, specialized research centers, external degree programs, community services, and high cost occupational training are other areas which could benefit from such treatment.

4. The Legislature should also direct the state planning agency to examine the potential for cooperative effort in its review of proposed new programs within each segment.

To the extent that the state planning agency develops the capacity to review all new educational and research programs proposed by the segments, it should include as an important element of its review process an examination of the extent to which the segments have considered opportunities for inter-segmental cooperation in carrying out the proposed new programs.

5. The Legislature should also call upon the governing board of each segment to report to the state planning agency annually on the development of inter-segmental and intra-segmental cooperative programs. The state planning agency should be directed to review and evaluate these annual reports and to submit them to the Legislature along with its evaluation and any recommendations for expanding such programs.

Although the Legislature can act to encourage inter-segmental and interinstitutional cooperation in several ways,

it must rely upon the state planning agency to develop and maintain a continuing interest in cooperative efforts. One way in which the planning agency can do this is to use its information gathering powers (augmented as necessary by the Legislature) to obtain from the governing board of each segment an annual report on the development of cooperative programs, and especially those cooperative programs which involve institutions from two or more segments. By doing so, the planning agency can become a forum for discussion of the benefits and costs of cooperative efforts and the extent to which the segments are giving encouragement to cooperative programs.

We have noted in the course of this study that some of those who are most interested in developing effective inter-institutional cooperation feel that more can be accomplished when the segments and individual campuses work together on their own than when the matter is taken to the present state planning agency, the Coordinating Council for Higher Education. Thus they are likely to oppose any proposal to make the state planning agency the principal forum for the discussion of ways and means of encouraging greater cooperation. Whether they are correct or not, however, we believe that there must be statewide guidance in this area. If the present planning agency is a hindrance rather than a help to cooperative efforts, then the solution is not to ignore it but to change it so that the agency can fulfill the role assigned.

6. The state planning agency should be directed to prepare and maintain an up-to-date inventory of all off-campus programs and facilities (for education, research, or community service) operated by the public and private institutions of higher education.

If the individual institutions of higher education are to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort in off-campus programs, they must have access to current information as to what programs are already in existence or being planned. To a large extent the recommended annual workshops on regional cooperation will enable the chief executive officers of the individual campuses to inform one another of their off-campus plans and programs. Yet it will also be helpful, we are convinced, for the state planning agency to maintain an inventory of off-campus activities to which any institution can refer in the course of planning new off-campus activities of its own.

The foregoing recommendations are intended to indicate ways in which interinstitutional cooperation can be encouraged without effecting a significant change in the existing organizational structure. If, on the other hand, the committee decides to go beyond simply encouraging voluntary interinstitutional cooperation through consortia and other devices, that it wants to develop regional cooperation involving the whole range of institutional functions, then we suggest the following additional action:

7. The state planning agency should be directed to report to the Legislature on the appropriate ways and means of establishing permanent regional councils throughout the state which will not only promote increased interinstitutional cooperation within each region but also serve, eventually, as the basic units for planning and coordinating (in consultation with the institutions themselves) the utilization and development of higher education resources of all kinds, public and private, throughout the state.

If there is to be a real effort to make maximum use of all available post-secondary educational resources in each of the state's major regions, then some form of regional council will have to be established on a continuing basis to exercise leadership in regional cooperation and coordination. Such councils should have a close relationship to the state planning agency, which should for that reason have a major role in determining how the councils are to be established, their membership, and their principal responsibilities. Pending such a study by the planning agency, it is suggested that the councils should include community representatives as well as representatives of the institutions of higher education within the regions, and they should have small full-time staffs to help them carry out their responsibilities. Among the initial duties of these councils would be the preparation of an estimate of the total demand for higher education within each region (for "non-traditional" as well as traditional forms of education), an estimate of the public and private resources available to meet that need, methods of regrouping or increasing those resources to meet the demand, and ways in which existing resources can be used more efficiently.

We are convinced that if such councils are created and receive strong support from the Legislature, the Governor, and the public and private colleges and universities, California can regain a position of leadership in the management of higher education for the maximum benefit of its citizens. We understand the fears of those who believe that any effort to accelerate the development of cooperative activities

may jeopardize current efforts of a less ambitious nature, and especially those within each segment. However, there is considerable evidence that the opportunities for interinstitutional cooperation will be severely and unnecessarily limited as long as the initiative must come from the segments rather than the individual campuses and communities within each region.

APPENDIX

SURVEY OF COOPERATIVE ARRANGEMENTS
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

A. COVER LETTER

B. QUESTIONNAIRE

C. LIST OF CONSORTIA

D. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, INC
a nonprofit planning organization

October 2, 1972

(Individual addresses
to heads of institutions)

The Joint Committee on the Master Plan for Higher Education of the California Legislature has asked us to conduct a study of interinstitutional cooperation. The Committee's interest lies in exploration of ways of encouraging cooperation which would be beneficial both to individual institutions and to higher education in the State as a whole.

This study is a late addition to the Committee's agenda, and thus it is urgent that we receive prompt responses to our request for information. We hope that you agree to the value of the study, and that you are willing to help us obtain a quick reply.

Would you arrange to have someone on your staff complete and mail the enclosed questionnaire by October 9? We are more interested in receiving the authoritative views of someone knowledgeable about cooperative activities than precise and exhaustive statistical data.

Many thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Robert Hind
Director
Western Region

PALO ALTO OFFICE: 770 WELCH ROAD, PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA 94304 (415) 327-2270

ACADEMY FOR EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
Study of Inter Institutional Cooperation
for the CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE JOINT COMMITTEE on
the Master Plan for Higher Education

Please answer the following questions and return the form to the AED, 770 Welch Road, Palo Alto, California, 94304, not later than October 9. Use additional sheets as necessary. If you have questions, please call Robert Hind, (415) 327-2270.

Institution: _____

Person providing data: _____

Title: _____

Telephone Number: _____

1. Is your institution a part of a formally organized consortium of educational institutions?

   Yes _____ No _____

   If yes, please provide the name, purpose, and number of institutions in each.

   If no, is there potential for a consortium in your area? For what purposes, and with what other institutions?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. Does your institution participate in faculty exchanges with other institutions?

   Yes _____ No _____

   If yes, please indicate what other institutions are involved, what fields, and provide some indication of the magnitude of the program (e.g., FTE faculty, number of courses). Any problems or imbalances?

   If no, is there potential for such exchanges in your area? What fields and institutions?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. Is there a formal, systematic arrangement for student exchanges or concurrent enrollment in your area in which your institution participates?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, please indicate what other institutions are involved, what fields, and provide some indication of magnitude.

If no, is there potential for such exchanges in your area? What fields and institutions?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Is your institution a participant in an arrangement (other than statewide articulation agreements among the three public sectors) to facilitate or articulate student transfer (e.g., from two years to four years colleges, 2-3 engineering programs, etc.)?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, please describe briefly the arrangement, participants, etc.

If no, is there need for some arrangement of this kind? For what purposes? Involving which institutions?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. Does your institution share facilities with other nearby institutions?

Yes _____ No _____

If yes, please describe briefly the arrangement(s).

If no, would there be value to you of such an arrangement? What kind, and for what purposes?

6. If there is potential for educational or economic gain through cooperative arrangements with other nearby institutions, and they have not materialized, would you briefly indicate why, together with any suggestions you might have for facilitating such arrangements? What would it take to get your institution involved?

CONSORTIA REPORTED BY QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONDENTS

1. League for Innovation in the Community Colleges

   Purpose: To foster innovative practices among community colleges.
   Members: 43 community colleges, of which 23 are in California.

2. Northern California Area Planning Council for Educational Programs

   Purpose: "...for the prime purpose of extending, improving, and articulating education programs".
   Members: College of the Siskiyous, Feather River, Lassen, Shasta, Yuba, and Butte Community Colleges.

3. Union of Independent Colleges of Art

   Purpose: A national consortium for mutual student exchange, etc.
   Members: Seven nonprofit accredited professional art colleges.

4. NASA-AMES Research Consortium

   Purpose: Research under NASA.
   Members: 12 California institutions, plus a large number of colleges and universities in other states.

5. Educational and Career Counseling

   Purpose: To provide educational and career counseling services to citizens not adequately served, plus training for counselors.
   Members: CSC San Bernardino, College of the Desert, San Bernardino Valley College, Victor Valley College, and Area II Planning Committee for Vocational-Technical Education.

6. Northern California Instructional Television Consortium (being developed)

   Purpose: To enlarge the service area of participating

institutions, enlarge their curricula, and to make "exceptional" faculty available to them through the use of televised instruction.

Members: 6 state universities, 2 state colleges, 40 community colleges and several ITV agencies.

7. Greater Los Angeles Consortium

Purpose: Cooperative development of urban programs.

Members: California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; CSU Los Angeles; UC Riverside, Whittier College, Loyola University.

8. Education Participation in the Community (EPIC)

Purpose: To develop a program of volunteer services on the campuses of participating institutions.

Members: California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; CSU Los Angeles; CSU Northridge; CSU Long Beach, CSC Dominguez Hills.

9. Inland Consortium

Purpose: "Joint planning and development to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of present mechanisms for problem identification and problem solving".

Members: Victor Valley, Barstow, Chaffey, and San Bernardino Valley Community Colleges, and CSC San Bernardino.

10. Health Manpower Steering Committee Consortium

Purpose: "To develop educational programs to meet health manpower needs in Area VI".

Members: CSC San Bernardino, CSU Los Angeles, Chaffey, Riverside City, San Bernardino Valley, and Mt. San Jacinto Community Colleges, College of the Desert, Claremont Colleges, Loma Linda University, UC Davis, and UC Riverside.

11. Southern California Ocean Study Consortium

Purpose: To enchance the study of marine sciences in southern California.

Members: California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; CSC Dominguez Hills; CSU Long Beach; CSU Fullerton, CSU Northridge.

12. Moss Landing Marine Laboratories

Purpose: Upper division and graduate study and research in marine sciences.
Members: CSU Hayward, CSU San Francisco, CSU San Jose, CSU Sacramento, CSU Fresno, and CSC Sonoma.

13. Inter-University Consortium for Political Research

Purpose: To facilitate the collection and processing of data for political and social research and to aid in the advanced training of social scientists in research methods.
Members: 133 institutions, including CSUC's as a group.

14. Orange County Consortium for Nursing Education

Purpose: The development and implementation of a prototype program of education and career progression for nurses.
Members: CSU Fullerton, UC Irvine, Fullerton Community College, Golden West College, and Santa Ana College, plus 22 participating hospitals in Orange County.

15. Urban Research Institute

Purpose: To "combine academic and practical approaches to the solution of a wide variety of county-wide problems."
Members: CSU Fullerton, Orange County Board of Supervisors (others to join).

16. South Bay-Harbor/Inglewood Centinela Health Services Educational Activities (HSEA)

Purpose: To meet health manpower needs of the community.
Members: CSU Long Beach, CSC Dominguez Hills, Loyola University, Harbor Community College, three hospitals, Regional Medical Program, Area VI (UCLA), community representatives.

17. Health Manpower-Watts/Compton

Purpose: To develop, implement, and maintain health manpower training programs to serve the community.

Members: CSU Long Beach, CSC Dominguez Hills, Charles Drew Graduate School of Medicine, Martin Luther King Hospital, community representatives.

18. San Fernando Valley Health Consortium

Purpose: "...to provide leadership in the articulation and coordination of the health manpower training programs in this region."

Members: Major hospitals and public and private institutions of higher education in the area.

19. Intercampus Cooperation in the Development and Implementation of Innovative Programs of Graduate Education in Nursing (COGEN)

Purpose: Cooperation in the development and implementation of new and innovative programs of graduate education in nursing.

Members: University of Nevada, Reno; CSU San Jose, CSU San Francisco, University of San Francisco, CSU Sacramento, CSU Chico, CSU Fresno, UC Davis, CSU Los Angeles, University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Stanford.

20. San Francisco Consortium

Purpose: To promote cooperative education planning and service among the institutions of higher education in San Francisco; to plan for improved community services through cooperative effort; to secure and administer financial grants to further individual institutional and cooperative programs, to provide a central office and staff to implement Consortium programs and provide institutional services as needed.

Members: CSU San Francisco, City College of San Francisco, Golden Gate College, Hastings College of Law, Lone Mountain College, UC San Francisco and the University of San Francisco.

21. Consortium of Western Universities and Colleges

Purpose: To aid collection of research material in international relations, area studies, and modern history.

Members: CSU San Francisco, Hoover Institution, University of San Francisco, CSU Fresno, University of Southern California, and five out-of-state institutions.

22. Camp Leonard-Sierra Buttes Field Campus Consortium

Purpose: To provide cooperative use of outdoor science education facility.
Members: CSU San Francisco, CSU Fresno, CSU Hayward, CSU Long Beach, CSU Los Angeles, CSU Sacramento, CSC Sonoma

23. Health Professions Council of San Francisco

Purpose: "...to assist greater San Francisco region in the solution of health problems through application of the resources and talent of its membership. Its activities will include service, research, classes, seminars and exhibitions in the health professions field."
Members: CSU San Francisco, UC San Francisco, City College of San Francisco, plus hospitals, public health agencies, professional societies, etc. in San Francisco.

24. Group Ten for the Seventies (GT-70)

Purpose: To seek funding and cooperation in innovative projects in curriculum and instruction.
Members: Ten community college districts throughout the country.

25. Bay Area Television Consortium of Community Colleges

Purpose: To prepare and broadcast instructional television programs.
Members: Chabot, Canada, College of San Mateo, Ohlone, and Skyline Community Colleges.

26. Greater Inland Empire Health Services/Education Activities Consortium

Purpose: "To study the feasibility of establishing a health services/educational activities center to serve the eastern section of Los Angeles County and the western section of San Bernardino County."
Members: California State Polytechnic University, Pomona; Claremont Graduate School; and Mt. San Antonio College.

27. Six Community College Manpower Planning Consortium

Purpose: "Joint planning of occupational education programs and the resolutions of problems and conflicts related thereto, elimination of unnecessary duplication of programs; improvement of vocational education."

Members: Chaffey College, Citrus College, Mt. San Antonio College, Rio Hondo College, Riverside City College, San Bernardino Valley College.

28. Southwest Community College Vocational Area Planning Group

Purpose: Cooperative planning of vocational education programs.

Members: Cerritos, Citrus, Coast, Compton, El Camino, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Mt. San Antonio, North Orange County, Rancho Santiago, Rio Hondo, and Santa Monica Community College Districts.

29. The San Gabriel Community College Library Cooperative

Purpose: "To share resources and to avoid duplication of purchase in expensive areas; to expedite sharing of resources, such as magazines and films, and sharing of information."

Members: Chaffey, Citrus, Cypress, Fullerton, Glendale, Mt. San Antonio, Pasadena City, and Rio Hondo Community Colleges.

30. Coordinating Council for Education in Health Sciences for San Diego and Imperial Counties

Purpose: "To assess health education needs and priorities; to coordinate education in the allied health fields and avoid unnecessary duplication; to recruit and encourage minority students to allied health professions; to establish a core curriculum which will provide students in allied health fields to move laterally as well as vertically in the pursuit of a profession."

Members: CSU San Diego, Medical School of the University of California at San Diego, Community Colleges, U.S. Naval Hospital Corps School, Regional Medical Program, Hospital Council, San Diego County Medical Society, Comprehensive Health Planning Association.

31. Border States University Consortium for Latin America

Purpose: "To set up center for Mexican-American bibliographical materials; to promote and finance student and faculty exchanges; to cooperate in the exchange of speakers; to obtain grants for these and other goals".

Members: CSU San Diego, University of California, University of New Mexico, University of Texas, El Paso.

32. San Diego Urban Observatory

Purpose: "Research the problems of the urban community".

Members: San Diego State, University of California, San Diego, City of San Diego.

33. Project Outreach

Purpose: "To develop and test the feasibility of a system for externalizing instruction to fit work schedules and lifestyles".

Members: CSU San Diego, UC Irvine, and several community colleges.

34. College Entrance Examination Board/Educational Testing Service/British Open University Project

Purpose: "To test the viability and efficacy of British Open University materials and procedures in the American educational system."

Members: Rutgers University, University of Maryland, Houston University, and California State University, San Diego.

35. Independent Colleges of Southern California

Purpose: To develop financial support.

Members: 15 private colleges in southern California.

36. World Campus Afloat

Purpose: To increase opportunities for and scope of international education for faculty and students.

Members: 21 institutions.

37. Consortium for Community College Television

Purpose: To produce and broadcast instructional

television for participating colleges.
Members: 25 community colleges in and near Los Angeles.

38. Southern California Consortium

Purpose: "...to improve the possibilities for success for high potential students attending the University."
Members: CSU Los Angeles and several community colleges.

39. Television Consortium of Valley Colleges

Purpose: Production and broadcast of televised courses.
Members: American River, Consumnes, Butte, Columbia, Modesto, Sacramento City, San Joaquin Delta, Sierra, and Yuba Community Colleges.

40. Consortium for Developing Junior Colleges

Purpose: "To improve instruction for low-income and minority students".
Members: Gavilan, Barstow, College of the Siskiyous, Cuesta, Humphreys, Lassen, Mt. San Jacinto, Napa, Palo Verde, Shasta, Sierra, Victor Valley, and Yuba Community Colleges.

41. Santa Clara County Area Vocational Education Planning Committee

Purpose: To prevent expensive, unnecessary duplication of vocational offerings.
Members: San Jose City, West Valley, Gavilan, Ohlone, De Anza, Foothill, and San Mateo Community Colleges.

42. Graduate Theological Union

Purpose: Mutual assistance by participating seminaries in providing graduate theological studies.
Members: American Baptist Seminary of the West, Church Divinity School of the Pacific, Franciscan School of Theology, Jesuit School of Theology, Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary, Pacific School of Religion, St. Albert's College, San Francisco Theological Seminary, and Starr King School for Religious Leadership.

43. San Diego County Community Colleges Association

Purpose: "...to further the educational aims of the community colleges of San Diego County and to encourage and promote activities for cooperative inter-college relations."

Members: Grossmont, Oceanside-Carlsbad, Palomar, San Diego City, San Diego Mesa, San Diego Evening, Southwestern, and Imperial Valley Colleges.

44. Border Colleges Television Consortium

Purpose: To improve educational opportunities in the US-Mexico border area for the disadvantaged, primarily Mexican-Americans.

Members: Imperial Valley and Southwestern Community Colleges, two community colleges in Arizona, and two in Texas.

45. Project CALL (Counseling Adults for Lifelong Learning)

Purpose: Adult counseling and education.

Members: Taft, West Hills, and Cerro Coso Community Colleges, California State College, Bakersfield.

46. Regional Vocational Planning Committee

Purpose: To coordinate vocational education programs.

Members: San Jose City, Foothill, West Valley, and Gavilan Community Colleges.

47. NORCAL Research Group

Purpose: Community college research.

Members: Approximately 30 community colleges.

48. Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities

Purpose: To promote experimentation and research in higher education.

Members: University of Redlands and 17 other institutions.

49. CATALYST Consortium for Educational TV

Purpose: Development of instructional television uses.

Members: Orange Coast, Miami-Dade, Chicago, and San Mateo Colleges.

50. San Diego Area Community College Film Library Consortium

Purpose: To purchase and circulate 16mm films to all members.
Members: San Diego City, Mesa, Grossmont, Southwestern, Mira Costa, Palomar, Imperial Valley Community Colleges.

51. Total Interlibrary Exchange

Purpose: "Share resources and services of member libraries".
Members: Approximately 73 libraries (2 and 4 year colleges, public and private schools, institutions, and special libraries).

52. San Joaquin Valley Community College Council for Occupational Education

Purpose: "Coordinate occupational programs and offerings in member colleges".
Members: 10 Community Colleges.

SUMMARY OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

YES-NO QUESTIONS

	U.C.	CSU&C	C.C.C.	Private C & U	All Inst.
1. Is your institution a part of a formally . .					
Yes	3	16	50	15	84
No	6	2	19	40	67
2. Does your institution participate.					
Yes	2	2	4	13	21
No	7	16	65	42	130
3. Is there a formal, ystematic arrange-ment					
Yes	3	2	34	25	64
No	6	15	32	28	81
4. Is your institution. .					
Yes	6	8	33	7	54
No	3	10	31	40	84
5. Does your institution share.					
Yes	8	12	33	32	85
No	1	7	35	25	68